PLAINTIFFS' OMNIBUS RESPONSE TO JANUARY 3, 2023 ORDER (DOC 4801)

T		I			T CHINADOS RESI O	TISE TO JANOANT	3, 2023 ONDER (DC	T 4001)	
Subdivision	Case No.	Plaintiffs' Firm Name	PFS Available in Repository on or before 10/14/22? Y or N	If PFS placed in Repository after 10/14/22, please note date placed in repository	Defendant	Has this Defendant Alleged a Service Defect in Recent Filings? Y or N	If YES, has service been perfected?	Date Service Perfected	Further Explanation Regarding Service Issue
Upshur County, TX v. Purdue		Simon Greenstone			Pharmacy Buying				
	1:17-op- 45085-DAP	Panatier, P.C.	Yes		Association	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
City of Lorain (OH)	1:17-op-45000	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Lorain, Ohio	1:17-op-45000	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Parma, Ohio	1:17-op-45001	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
	1:17-op-45001	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Richland County Children's		1			,				
1	1:17-op-45003	Napoli Shkolnik	No	NA	Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	defendant to be dismissed
Richland County Children's					т того при по по при по по при по	1.52	1	-,,	
	1:17-op-45003	Napoli Shkolnik	No	NA	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	defendant to be dismissed
	1:17-op-45005	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	10.1	Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	determinate to be distributed
	1:17-op-45005	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
city of Toledo, Offic	1.17-0p-43003	Napoli Shkolilik	163		iviyiaii	163	163	2/13/2023	
City of Birmingham, Alabama	1:17-op-45008	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Birmingham, Alabama	1:17-op-45008	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Fiscal Court of Spencer County (KY)	1:17-op-45014	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	See Explanation.	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	Spencer County, KY, terminated the National Consortium's Representation via email on 07/08/2021 because it mistakenly hired 2 different groups of attorneys to represent it in the opioid litigation who unwittingly filed separate complaints with disparate defendants. The National Consortium served a PFS on December 18, 2018. However, the National Consortium did not upload the PFS to the repository. The parallel case number is Case No. 1:19-op-46029-DAP and it appears that a PFS in that case was timely uploaded to the repository.
Fiscal Court of Spencer County, Kentucky	1:17-op-45014	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	See Explanation.	Amneal	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	Spencer County, KY, terminated the National Consortium's Representation via email on 07/08/2021 because it mistakenly hired 2 different groups of attorneys to represent it in the opioid litigation who unwittingly filed separate complaints with disparate defendants. The National Consortium served a PFS on December 18, 2018. However, the National Consortium did not upload the PFS to the repository. The parallel case number is Case No. 1:19-op-46029-DAP and it appears that a PFS in that case was timely uploaded to the repository.
		Levin Papantonio							
Bell County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45026	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
		Levin Papantonio							
Knox County Fiscal Court (KS)	1:17-op-45028	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/29/2020	Def. Notice lists case as Knox, KS, when the case number is for Knox County, KY.
		Levin Papantonio							
Leslie County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45029	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Levin Papantonio						, , , , , ,	
Leslie County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45029	Rafferty	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
Whitley County Fiscal Court		Levin Papantonio	1.00			1.52			
	1:17-op-45030	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/17/2020	
Whitley County Fiscal Court	2.2.7 op 10000	Levin Papantonio	1.00		3111 31111111			11,17,1010	
	1:17-op-45030	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	s Yes	Yes	11/17/2020	
-	1.17 OP 13030	Levin Papantonio	163		Questinamaccatical	5 165	163	11/1//2020	
Clay County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45031	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
olay county riscar court (KT)	1, OP 43031	Levin Papantonio	100		Jiti Jiiiilii	1.00	100	12, 10, 2020	
Clay County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45031	Rafferty	Yes		UCB	Yes		12/18/2020	
	1:17-op-45031	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
	1:17-op-45032 1:17-op-45032	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Dayton, Onio	1:17-0p-45032	ічарон зпконік	res		iviyian	res	res	2/13/2023	Deducation of Comics and according filed 2/20/22 Hillians Discourse High HCA leasures
City of Tacoma, Washington	1:17-op-45047	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
	4.47 45010	Levin Papantonio			Amneal		w	0/20/2012	
People of State of Illinois, et al.	1:1/-op-45049	Rafferty	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	8/26/2019	
		Levin Papantonio			Pharmacy Buying	1	1		
People of State of Illinois, et al.	1:17-op-45049	Rafferty	Yes		Association	Yes	Yes	8/26/2019	
Wyoming County Commission (WV)	1:17-op-45051	McGraw Law Office	No		JM Smith	No			PFS will be forthcoming

	T	1	_	_	_		1		
		Levin Papantonio							
Kanawha County, WV	1:17-op-45063	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	2/10/2023	
Columbia County v. Purdue	·	Levin Papantonio							
	1:17-op-45068	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Voc	3/25/2021	
Filalilla L.P., et al.	1.17-0p-45006					162	Yes	3/23/2021	
		Lockridge Grindal Nauen			Amneal				
Mower County, Minnesota	1:17-op-45072	P.L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/25/2019	
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of McLennan, Texas	1:17-op-45075	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Harrison Davis Morrison		, .,					
County of McLennan, Texas	1.17 on 45075		No	2/16/2023	NA dan	No			
County of McLennan, Texas	1:17-op-45075	Jones		2/10/2023	Siviyian	No			
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of McLennan, TX	1:17-op-45075	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of McLennan, TX	1:17-op-45075	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
			1						
					A				
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
City of Fort Payne, AL	1:17-op-45079	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	1/4/2021	
	,	Levin Papantonio							
Fort Payne, AL	1:17-op-45079	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	No	N/A	Plaintiff did not sue defendant.
		· /		4 /0 /000			INO	IN/A	
	1:17-op-45081	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Lafayette, Indiana	1:17-op-45081	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Lafayette, Indiana	1:17-op-45081	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Lafayette, IN	1:17-op-45081	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
	1:17-op-45082	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
	1:17-op-45082	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			
									A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
-	1:17-op-45082	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Hammond, IN	1:17-op-45082	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
St. Louis County, Missouri	1:17-op-45083	LLC	N	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
on zours county, missour.	1117 00 15000	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	.,	11/10/2022					
	4.47 45000			44 46 12022					
St. Louis County, Missouri	1:17-op-45083	LLC	N	11/16/2022	Mylan	No			
		Levin Papantonio							
Boyd County Fiscal Court (KY)_	1:17-op-45084	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
		Simon Greenstone							
County of Upshur (TX)	1:17-op-45085	Panatier, P.C.	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
country or opsilar (174)	1.17 op 45005	Simon Greenstone	1.03		SIVI SIIIICII	163	1111100033		Walver of Service of Summons service counser on 2/21/2025.
	4.7								60 60
County of Morris (TX)	1:17-op-45086	Panatier, P.C.	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 3/20/19
City of Indianapolis, IN, et al.	1:17-op-45091	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented on 12/18/2018
City of Indianapolis, Indiana, et									
	1:17-op-45091	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	3 Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented on 12/18/2018
	1.17-0ρ-43031	Conen & Ivialad, EEF	140	1/3/2023	Ammedi	INO			With 5 was originally served on 12/17/2016 and supplemented on 12/16/2016
City of Indianapolis, Indiana, et		1		. /- /	J				
al.	1:17-op-45091	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	3 Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented on 12/18/2018
City of Indianapolis, Indiana;									
	1:17-op-45091	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented on 12/18/2018
City of Indianapolis, IN and					,				
	1.17 on 45004	Cohon O Malada I II D	l _{No}	4 /2 /2022	l m divia m	No			A DEC was eviginally conved on 12/17/2010 and assured as 12/17/2010
Marion County, IN	1:17-op-45091	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	sindivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented on 12/18/2018
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Adams County, WI	1:17-op-45093	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Adams County, WI	1:17-op-45093	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
rtaanis county, vvi	1.17 op 45055		140	11/10/2022	KVK TCCII	110			
		1							
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		[Amneal				
Adams County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45093	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Adams County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45093	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	5/31/2019	
	p .5555	Frank C Dudeneher, Jr.,	† · ·	-,,	-,,				The PFS was submitted on 04/08/20 and again on 10/13/22. Out of abundance of caution a further
S-att Cause Book 5									
Scott County Board of		The Dudenhefer Law							PFS was placed in repository on 02/14/23. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/21/23,
Commissioners, Indiana	1:17-op-45094	Firm LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		received 02/22/23.
		Frank C Dudeneher, Jr.,							The PFS was submitted on 04/08/20 and again on 10/13/22. Out of abundance of caution a further
Scott County, Indiana Board of		The Dudenhefer Law							PFS was placed in repository on 02/14/23. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/27/23,
	1:17-op-45094	Firm LLC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		received 03/01/2023
Commissioners, muland	1.11-0p-43034	I IIIII LLC	1 53	<u> </u>	HINHIG	103	1111100033	<u> </u>	10001400 001011 5050

		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Marathon County, WI	1:17-op-45095	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Marathon County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45095	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
G	4.5	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		11/10/2022	D. L. L. D.	.,	.,	C /2 /2040	
Green County, WI	1:17-op-45096	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Green County, WI	1:17 45000	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	NI-	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	N =			
Green County, Wi	1:17-op-45096	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-TECH	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Green County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45096	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Green county, Wisconsin	1.17 00 43030	Levin Papantonio	110	11/10/2022	That maccaticals, me.	163			STETION GROWING
Tallapoosa County (AL)	1:17-op-45097	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/24/2019	
, , ,		Levin Papantonio							
Tallapoosa County, AL	1:17-op-45097	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Sauk County, WI	1:17-op-45098	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Iowa County, WI	1:17-op-45099	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Iowa County, WI	1:17-op-45099	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Iowa County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45099	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
	4.47 45000	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		44/40/2022	Amneal	w.			SUCAL A District
Iowa County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45099	LLC Levin Papantonio	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Luzerne County, Pennsylvania v	1:17 on 45100	Rafferty	Voc		Value Drug	Voc	Voc	3/25/2021	
Luzerne County, Pennsylvania V.	. 1.17-0p-45100	Levin Papantonio	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
Gadsden, AL	1:17-op-45101	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	1/4/2021	
dadaden, AL	1.17 OF 45101	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	103		WIIII DIXIC	103	103	1/4/2021	
Door County, WI	1:17-op-45104	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
200. 004(1)	1.1.7 op 1516 :	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		11/10/2022	Danota Drag	1.00	1.00	0,0,2023	
Door County, WI	1:17-op-45104	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Door County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45104	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Fond du Lac County, WI	1:17-op-45106	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Fond du Lac County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45106	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Douglas County, WI	1:17-op-45107	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Dauglas County 147	4.47 - 45405	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	N -	11/10/2022	WW To -1-	N-			
Douglas County, WI	1:17-op-45107	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No	+		
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Douglas County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45107	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Douglas County, WISCONSIII	±.±/-∪p-43±0/	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	140	11/10/2022	i narmaceuticais, inc.	163	+		SHE NOCE WISHING
Rock County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45108	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Mylan	No			
	op 40100	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		,,,	,	1.0			
Rock County, WI	1:17-op-45108	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
	.,	-		, -,					
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Rock County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45108	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Levin Papantonio							
Pulaski County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45109	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	
		Levin Papantonio							
County of Perry (KY)	1:17-op-45110	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceutical	s Yes	Yes	12/10/2020	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Eau Claire County, WI	1:17-op-45112	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
1		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Eau Claire County, WI	1:17-op-45112	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			

			1						
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Eau Claire County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45112	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Washington County, WI	1:17-op-45114	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
W. 1:		Simmons Hanly Conroy,	1	44 /40 /0000	10 W T I	1			
Washington County, WI	1:17-op-45114	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Washington County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45114	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,			·				
Grant County, WI	1:17-op-45115	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Grant County, WI	1:17-op-45115	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Grant County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45115	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Grant County, Wisconsin	1.17-0p-43113	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	INO	11/16/2022	Filaitilaceuticais, ilic.	res			Site Not Fulsuing
Rusk County, WI	1:17-op-45116	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
	,	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		,					
Columbia County, WI	1:17-op-45118	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Columbia County, WI	1:17-op-45118	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Columbia County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45118	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
columbia county, wisconsin	1.17-0p-43110	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	NO	11/10/2022	Tharmaceaticals, inc.	163			Site Not Fursuing
Shawano County, WI	1:17-op-45119	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Oconto County, WI	1:17-op-45120	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,	1	44 /40 /0000	Amneal				
Oconto County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45120	LLC Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Jackson County, WI	1:17-op-45121	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Jackson County, VVI	1.17 OP 45121	LLC	140	11/10/2022	KVK TCCII	140			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Jackson County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45121	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Jefferson County, WI	1:17-op-45122	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Jefferson County, Wisconsin	1:17-on-45122	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Vas			SHC Not Pursuing
Jenerson County, wisconsin	1.17-0β-43122	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	NO	11/10/2022	Filarinaceuticais, inc.	163			Site Not Fulsuing
Washburn County, WI	1:17-op-45123	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
·	-	Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Washburn County, WI	1:17-op-45123	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Machburn Courts Misses	1.17 on 45422	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No.	11/10/2022	Amneal	Vas			CLIC Not Duraning
Washburn County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45123	LLC Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Langlade County WI	1:17-op-45124	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
			1	,,		1			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Langlade County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45124	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Florence County, WI	1:17-op-45125	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Florence County M/I	1:17 05 45125	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		11/19/2022	VVV Toch	No			
Florence County, WI	1:17-op-45125	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Florence County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45125	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Price County, WI	1:17-op-45126	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
			· _						

	1			I	T	T	T	T	
		Circura and Hamby Commerc			A				
Brice County Wissensin	1:17-op-45126	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Voc			SHC Not Pursuing
Price County, Wisconsin	1:17-0p-45126	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	NO	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Wood County, WI	1:17-op-45127	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
	1117 00 10127			11, 10, 1011	KVIK Teen				
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Wood County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45127	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Sheboygan County, WI	1:17-op-45128	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Oneida County, WI	1:17-op-45129	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Oneida County Wissensin	4.47 45420	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	N =	44/40/2022	Amneal	V			CLIC Net Duraning
Oneida County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45129	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Ashland County, WI	1:17-op-45130	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Asimana county, wi	1.17-0p-45150	LLC	NO	11/10/2022	KVK TCCII	140			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Ashland County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45130	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
-		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Burnett County, WI	1:17-op-45131	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Burnett County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45131	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		/ /	10 m = 1				
Chippewa County, WI	1:17-op-45132	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Chippewa County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45132	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
emprewa county, wisconsin	1.17-0p-45152	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	NO	11/10/2022	Tharmaccaticals, inc.	163			Site Not Fursuing
Dunn County, WI	1:17-op-45133	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
	.,	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	-	, ., .					
Dunn County, WI	1:17-op-45133	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Dunn County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45133	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		/ /		.,	.,	6/0/0040	
Forest County, WI	1:17-op-45134	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Forest County, WI	1:17-op-45134	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Forest County, Wi	1.17-0p-43134	LLC	NO	11/16/2022	KVK-TECH	INO			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Forest County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45134	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
.,,	.,	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	-	, ., .					
Manitowoc County, WI	1:17-op-45135	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Manitowoc County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45135	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Marguetta County 140	4.47 45400	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	N-	44/40/2022	WW To-b	N -			
Marquette County, WI	1:17-op-45136	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Marquette County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45136	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
marquette edunty, trisconom	1117 Op 10100	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		11/10/1011	That made a close of the close				
Sawyer County, WI	1:17-op-45137	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Trempealeau County, WI	1:17-op-45138	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Waushara County, WI	1:17-op-45139	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Waushara County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45139	LLC Size and the plants Comment	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Buffalo County, WI	1:17 on 45141	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	VVV Toch	No			
Burraio County, WI	1:17-op-45141	LLC	INO	11/10/2022	KVK-Tech	No	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

			.						,
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Buffalo County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45141	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Calumet County, WI	1:17-op-45142	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Calumet County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45142	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Dodge County, WI	1:17-op-45143	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Dodge County, WI	1:17-op-45143	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Dodge County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45143	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Kenosha County, WI	1:17-op-45144	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
-	·								
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Kenosha County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45144	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
,,,	- 1	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		, -, -					
Marinette County, WI	1:17-op-45145	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
mamette deanty, tri	1117 00 10110	120		11/10/2011	NVN Teen				
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Marinette County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45145	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Voc			SHC Not Pursuing
Marinette County, Wisconsin	1.17-0p-43143	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	NO	11/10/2022	Filatifiaceuticais, file.	163			SHC NOT FUISUING
Monroe County, WI	1:17-op-45146	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Monroe County, Wi	1.17-0p-45146	LLC	INO	11/10/2022	KVK-TECH	INO			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			A				
NA	4.47 454.46		N.	44 /40 /2022	Amneal				CLIC Net Describe
Monroe County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45146	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
1	_	Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Monroe County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45146	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			_				
St. Croix County, WI	1:17-op-45147	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
St. Croix County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45147	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Vernon County, WI	1:17-op-45148	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Vernon County, WI	1:17-op-45148	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Vernon County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45148	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Clark County, WI	1:17-op-45150	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Clark County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45150	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
(1) People of State of Illinois;					Associated				
(2) People of Gallatin County,					Pharmacies				
IL; and		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
I *	1:17-op-45152	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
(-,		Levin Papantonio						,, -323	
Buncombe County (NC)	1:17-op-45153	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/18/2019	
zancomoc county (NC)	2.17 OF 13133	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,			J Jillien			.,10,2013	
		Olstein, Brody &							Demand For Waiver Sent 2/15/2023; Counsel for Indivior acknowleged receipt of demand on
Township of Invington NI	1:17-op 45156	Agnello, P.C.	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	Vac	In Process		2/22/2023. Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
Township of Irvington, NJ	1:17-op-45156		No	2/16/2023	IIIUIVIOI	Yes	In Process		2/22/2023. Provided to Process servers on 2/24/2023.
County of Titue (TV)	1.17 on 45464	Simon Greenstone	Vas		INA Consists	Ves	In Dragge		Molyar of Carries of Cummons cont. to
	1:17-op-45161	Panatier, P.C.	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 3/20/19.
City of Manchester, New						L	L	2/4.4/2022	
Hampshire	1:17-op-45163	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	1	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Manchester, New					[L.		
Hampshire	1:17-op-45163	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	<u> </u>	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	

Anderson (Sheriff of Avoyelles		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Parish), LA	1:17-op-45164	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Anderson, Douglas (Avoyelles		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:17-op-45164	LLC	No	1/3/2023		No			
Douglas Anderson, Avoyelles		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale				
Parish Sheriff	1:17-op-45164	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Drug	Yes	Yes	6/7/2019	
Douglas Anderson, Duly									
Elected Sheriff of Avoyelles									
Parish, in His Capacity as									
Officer Ex Officio of the									
Avoyelles Parish Sheriff's									
Office and the Avoyelles Parish	4.47 45464	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	la.	4 /2 /2022	Amneal				
Law Enforcement District	1:17-op-45164	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	res			SHC Not Pursuing
Dauglas Anderson Duly									
Douglas Anderson, Duly Elected Sheriff of Avoyelles									
Parish, in His Capacity as									
Officer Ex Officio of the									
Avoyelles Parish Sheriff's									
Office and the Avoyelles Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Law Enforcement District (LA)	1·17-on-45164	LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Emoreement bistrice (ET)	1.17 Op 45104		110	1/3/2023	Jivi Simen	110			
Douglas Anderson, Sheriff of		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:17-op-45164	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
., ,	- I	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		, , , , , ,		-			
Pierce County, WI	1:17-op-45165	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Pierce County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45165	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Waupaca County, WI	1:17-op-45166	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Waupaca County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45166	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Waupaca County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45166	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Lincoln County, WI	1:17-op-45167	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
li de la Constantina		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		/ /	Amneal	.,			
Lincoln County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45167		No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
D. C. I. C	4.47 45460	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	la.	44 /40 /2022	10.07 =	la.			
Bayfield County, WI	1:17-op-45168	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Bayfield County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45168		No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Voc			SHC Not Pursuing
Bayriela County, Wisconsin	1.17-0p-43108	LLC	INO	11/16/2022	Filarifiaceuticais, filc.	ies			SHE NOT FUISUING
Jefferson County Commission	1:17-OP-45170	Skinner Law Firm			TopRx	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
Jefferson County Commission	1.17 01 -431/0	CARRIEL LUW FIIIII			. Sprin			1	and the second s
	1:17-op-45170	Skinner Law Firm			JM Smith	No			Dismissed 03/22/2023
Jefferson County Commission,	Op 10170					-			
	1:17-op-45170	Skinner Law Firm			Hikma	No			This Defendant is not named in the Complaint
Jefferson County Commission,					American Sales				·
	1:17-op-45170	Skinner Law Firm				Yes			Dismissed 02/28/2023
Jefferson County Commission,	·				Masters				
	1:17-op-45170	Skinner Law Firm			Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed 03/22/2023
Jefferson County Commission,									
wv	1:17-op-45170	Skinner Law Firm			Indivior	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
Berkeley County Council, West									
Virginia	1:17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm			Hikma	No			Dismissed on 02/28/2023
					American Sales				
Berkeley County Council, WV	1:17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm			Company, LLC	Yes			Dismissed on 02/28/2023

					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
					Inc/American				
Berkeley County Council, WV	1:17-op-45171	Skinner Law Flrm			Associated Pharmacies	Yes			Dismissed on 02/28/2023
				-	Masters				
Berkeley County Council, WV	1:17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm			Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed 03/22/2023
Berkeley country counten, vv v	1.17 OP 43171	Skiiniei Luw i iiii			Thatmaccatical	103			5131113300 007 227 2020
Berkeley County Council, WV	1:17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm			Indivior	No			Dismissed on 02/28/2023
Hilton (Sheriff of Rapides	1.17-0p-43171	Simmons Hanly Conroy,			marvior	140			DISTRIBUTE OF 02/20/2025
	1:17-op-45178	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Hilton, William (Rapides Parish	1.17-0p-43176	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	1/	3/2023	Suridoz/ Novartis	IVO			
	1:17-op-45178	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Sheriir , Eddisiana)	1.17-0p-43178	LLC	1/	3/2023	TIIKITU	NO			
William Hilton, Duly Elected									
Sheriff of Rapides Parish, in His									
Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of									
the Rapides Parish Sheriff's									
Office and the Rapides Parish		Cimmons Hanly Convoy			Amanaal				
	1:17-op-45178	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No 1/		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Vos			SHC Not Pursuing
Law Enforcement District	1:17-op-45178	LLC	NO 1/	/3/2023	Pharmaceuticals, inc.	Yes			SHC NOT PURSUING
Meller of teles of B. I. Elser of									
William Hilton, Duly Elected									
Sheriff of Rapides Parish, in His									
Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of									
the Rapides Parish Sheriff's									
Office and the Rapides Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		10 10 000					
	1:17-op-45178	LLC	No 1/		JM Smith	No			
William Hilton, Rapides Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale				
	1:17-op-45178	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023	Drug	Yes	Yes	11/22/2019	
William Hilton, Sheriff of		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		<i>'- '</i>					
	1:17-op-45178	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023	iviyian	No			
Mancuso (Sheriff of Calcasieu		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		10.10.000	Contraction				
	1:17-op-45179	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Mancuso, Tony (Calcasieu		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		<i>'- '</i>					
	1:17-op-45179	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023		No			
Tony Mancuso, Calcasieu		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale			/ . /	
Parish Sheriff	1:17-op-45179	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023	Drug	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
Tony Mancuso, Duly Elected									
Sheriff of Calcasieu Parish, in									
His Capacity as Officer Ex									
Officio of the Calcasieu Parish									
Sheriff's Office and the									
Calcasieu Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Enforcement District	1:17-op-45179	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Tony Mancuso, Duly Elected									
Sheriff of Calcasieu Parish, in									
His Capacity as Officer Ex									
Officio of the Calcasieu Parish									
Sheriff's Office and the									
Calcasieu Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:17-op-45179	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Tony Mancuso, Sheriff of		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:17-op-45179		No 1/	/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Garber (Sheriff of Lafayette		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:17-op-45180	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Garber, Mark (Lafayette		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Parish Sheriff, Louisiana)	1:17-op-45180	LLC	No 1/	/3/2023	Hikma	No			
									

Mark T. Garber, Duly Elected									
Sheriff of Lafayette Parish, in									
His Capacity as Officer Ex									
Officio of the Lafayette Parish									
Sheriff's Office and the									
Lafayette Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Enforcement District	1:17-op-45180	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
	·								
Mark T. Garber, Duly Elected									
Sheriff of Lafayette Parish, in									
His Capacity as Officer Ex									
Officio of the Lafayette Parish									
Sheriff's Office and the									
Lafayette Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Enforcement District (LA)	1:17-op-45180	LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Mark T. Garber, Lafayette		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale				
Parish Sheriff	1:17-op-45180	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Drug	Yes	Yes	12/4/2019	
Mark T. Garber, Sheriff of		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Lafayette Parish, Louisiana	1:17-op-45180	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Polk County, IA v. Purdue	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Pharmacy Buying				
Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op- 45116-DAP	LLC	No	11/18/2022		Yes	Yes	5/31/2019	
Adair Co., IA et al v. Purdue	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Pharmacy Buying				
Pharma LP et al	1:18-op- 45122-DAP	LLC	No	11/18/2022		Yes	Yes	5/30/2019	
Black Hawk County et al v.	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Pharmacy Buying				
Purdue Pharma LP et al.	1:18-op- 45303-DAP	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Association	Yes	Yes	5/31/2019	
Lafayette County, MO									
AmerisourceBergen Drug					Pharmacy Buying				
Corporation, et al	1:18-op- 45840-DAP	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Association	Yes	Yes	7/15/2019	Executed Waiver of Service filed on 2/21/2023.
Cass County, MO v.									
AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp.					Pharmacy Buying				
et al	1:18-op- 45841-DAP	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Association	Yes	Yes	7/15/2019	Executed Waiver of Service filed on 2/21/2023.
Allamakee County v. Purdue		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Pharmacy Buying				
Pharma LP et al	1:18-op- 45983-DAP	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Association	Yes	Yes	5/31/2019	
		Levin Papantonio							
County of Hardin (IL)	1:18-op-45003	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals		Yes	3/30/2021	
									PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these
									pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on
									3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted
									Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the
									folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on
									3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format
									of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one
									pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the
									PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
		Friedman, Dazzio &							reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
City of Tuscumbia (AL)	1:18-op-45005	Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
									PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these
									pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on
									3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted
									Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the
									folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on
									3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format
									of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one
									pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the
									PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
		Friedman, Dazzio &							reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
County of Colbert (AL)	1:18-op-45005	Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

	ī					1		
County of Franklin (AL)	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Cherokee (AL)	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Cherokee, Alabama et al	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Cherokee, Alabama; City of Tuscumbia, Alabama; County of Franklin, Alabama; County of Colbert, Alabama	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Cherokee, AL City of Tuscumbia, AL, Counties of Colbert and Franklin, AL	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

		T	T	T	1	1	Т	Т	
		Levin Papantonio							
New Hanover County (NC)	1:18-op-45006	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
City of Opp, AL	1:18-op-45011	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
		,							
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Lauria Banantania							
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
Yadkin County, NC	1:18-op-45014	Rafferty	Yes	4.4	Associated Pharmacies		Yes	9/11/2019	
City of New Castle, IN	1:18-op-45016	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
	1:18-op-45016	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of New Castle, Indiana	1:18-op-45016	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of New Castle, Indiana	1:18-op-45016	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of New Castle, IN	1:18-op-45016	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Sunflower County (MS)	1:18-op-45020	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
Sunflower County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45020	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Sunflower County, MS	1:18-op-45020		No	1/3/2023	· '	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	
Jannower Country, 1913	1.10 Op=43020	Diaz Law I IIIII, FLLC	1	1/3/2023	uivioi	103	163	-1	
Humphrous County Minden	1:10 on 45024	Diaz Laur Firma BUIC	No	1/3/2023	Mulan	No			
Humphreys County, Mississippi		Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No			No	V	2/22/2022	
Humphreys County, MS	1:18-op-45021	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	
Washington County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45022	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Washington County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45022	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Washington County, MS	1:18-op-45022	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Washington County, MS	1:18-op-45022	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	
	1:18-op-45029	LCHB	No	3/14/2023		Yes	Yes	1	Waiver of service filed on docket 3/20/2023.
	1:18-op-45029	LCHB	No	3/14/2023		No			
Sincir county, remiessee	1.10 OP +3023	Harrison Davis Morrison	110	3/11/2023	Wiyiun	110			
County of Montgomory Toyas	1:10 on 45000		No	2/16/2023	Lilema	No			
County of Montgomery, Texas	1:18-0p-45030	Jones	INU	2/10/2023	Пікіна	No			
		Harrison Davis Morrison		0/46/0000					
County of Montgomery, Texas	1:18-op-45030	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of Montgomery, TX	1:18-op-45030	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of Montgomery, TX	1:18-op-45030	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
County of Lake, Ohio	1:18-op-45032	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Lake, Ohio	1:18-op-45032	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
	1:18-op-45035		No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
., (.,	-	,		, , , , ,				, ,	
Claiborne County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45035	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			
Claibottle County, Wississippi	1.16-0p-43033	Diaz Law Film, File	NO	1/3/2023	Ailileai	INO			
									We mistakenly believed that service was unnecessary at the time of filing the Short Form
									Complaint. We emailed Target Corporation's counsel on 2/21/2023 after realizing that service was
									necessary to ask if they would accept service. Having not heard back, we followed up on
									2/24/2023. Target Corporation's counsel responded that they needed to confirm with their client
									whether they could accept service. On 3/2/2023, we emailed waiver of service forms with the
Butler County Board of									Short Form Complaint and Original Complaint. Target Corporation's counsel emailed on 3/3/2023
-	1:18-op-45037	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	Target Corporation	Yes	No	N/A	with a refusal to accept service.
		<u>'</u>							
									We mistakenly believed that service was unnecessary at the time of filing the Short Form
									Complaint. We emailed Mylan's counsel on 2/21/2023 after realizing that service was necessary to
									ask if they would accept service. Having not heard back, we followed up on 2/24/2023. Again,
									with no response, we emailed the approved waiver of service forms to counsel on 3/2/2023 with
									the Short Form Complaint, Original Complaint, and waiver of service forms. Mylan's counsel
									emailed on 3/2/2023 acknowledging receipt of our messages and indicating that they "intend to
									respond within the timeframe set forth in Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and in
Butler County Board of									advance of the March 29 extended deadline for submission of your response to our status report."
Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45037	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	On 3/20/2023, counsel for Mylan confirmed that it would not be waiving service.
Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45037	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	ıvıylan	Yes	NO	N/A	Un 3/20/2023, counsel for Mylan confirmed that it would not be waiving service.

	T	ľ	<u>, </u>	ľ		.		1	
Butler County Board of Commissioners, OH	1:18-op-45037	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	Indivior	Yes	No	N/A	We mistakenly believed that service was unnecessary at the time of filing the Short Form Complaint. We emailed Indivior's counsel on 2/21/2023 after realizing that service was necessary to ask if they would accept service. Having not heard back, we followed up on 2/24/2023. Again, with no response, we emailed the approved waiver of service forms to counsel on 3/2/2023 with the Short Form Complaint, Original Complaint, and waiver of service forms. Indivior's counsel emailed on 3/16/2023 with a refusal to accept service.
County of Ashtabula, OH	1:18-op-45050	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			
County of Ashtabula, Ohio	1:18-op-45050	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	1:18-op-45052	LLBO Legal Dept.		N/A	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	
		Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,		,					
		Olstein, Brody &							Demand For Waiver Sent 2/15/2023; Counsel for Indivior acknowleged receipt of demand on
Township Of Bloomfield, NJ	1:18-op-45053	Agnello, P.C.	No	2/15/202	3 Indivior	Yes	In Process		2/22/2023. Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
City of Lansing, MI	1:18-op-45054	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/202	Masters 2 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Lansing, Michigan	1:18-op-45054	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/202	2 Mylan	No			
					Masters				In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Grand Traverse, MI	1:18-op-45056	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/202	2 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
The state of the s	15556	The second of th	1:	12, 1, 202		1:25	1:00	-,,1	μr · · · · ·

County of Grand Traverse,	T								
· ·	1:18-op-45056	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Clinton County Board of Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45060	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	We mistakenly believed that service was unnecessary at the time of filing the Short Form Complaint. We emailed Mylan's counsel on 2/21/2023 after realizing that service was necessary to ask if they would accept service. Having not heard back, we followed up on 2/24/2023. Again, with no response, we emailed the approved waiver of service forms to counsel on 3/2/2023 with the Short Form Complaint, Original Complaint, and waiver of service forms. Mylan's counsel emailed on 3/2/2023 acknowledging receipt of our messages and indicating that they "intend to respond within the timeframe set forth in Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and in advance of the March 29 extended deadline for submission of your response to our status report." We have not heard back yet. On 3/20/2023, counsel for Mylan confirmed that it would not be waiving service.
Clinton County Board of Commissioners, OH	1:18-op-45060	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	Indivior	Yes	No	N/A	We mistakenly believed that service was unnecessary at the time of filing the Short Form Complaint. We emailed Indivior's counsel on 2/21/2023 after realizing that service was necessary to ask if they would accept service. Having not heard back, we followed up on 2/24/2023. Again, with no response, we emailed the approved waiver of service forms to counsel on 3/2/2023 with the Short Form Complaint, Original Complaint, and waiver of service forms. Indivior's counsel emailed on 3/16/2023 with a refusal to accept service.
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of Nolan, Texas	1:18-op-45061	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
County of Nolan, Texas	1:18-op-45061	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones Harrison Davis Morrison	No	2/16/2023	B Mylan	No			
Nolan County, TX	1:18-op-45061	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
The County of Nolan, Texas	1:18-op-45061	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
The County of Nolan, Texas	1:18-op-45061	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
Nolon County, TV	1.10 00 45064	Harrison Davis Morrison	Ne	2/46/2022	Indivior	No			
Nolan County, TX	1:18-op-45061	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
City of Nashua, New Hampshire	1:18-op-45062	Napoli Shkolnik Harrison Davis Morrison	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Wichita, Texas	1:18-op-45064	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
County of Wichita, Texas	1:18-op-45064	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023		No			
County of Wichita, TX	1:18-op-45064	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
county of wichita, IX	1.10 Op 43004	Harrison Davis Morrison	110	2/10/2023	Januoz/ Noval tis	1.00			
County of Wichita, TX	1:18-op-45064	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			

Country of Chippewa, Michigan 138-op-45066 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No 12/1/2		1	1	1			1	1	
in 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person service dientified themselves as a PAUL service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's clients' service was improper. In the unikely event that W&L's clients' service was improper, in the unikely event that W&L's clients' service was improper, in service, in addition, under Ohio law, for a court to kell a sligged deficiency in service, in addition, under Ohio law, for a court to kell a sligged deficiency in service, in addition, under Ohio law, for a court to kell a sligged deficiency in service, in addition, under Ohio law, for a court to kell a sligged deficiency in service, in addition, inches in the analysis of the service of process upon Masters, prepassive Direct, inc. v. Shidari, inc. S. total engage and the service of process upon Masters, prepassive Direct, inc. v. Shidari, inc. v. Shader, is a McL'ad 606, 65 ID (0h. 1955). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so venif W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, processible desired as if they had, in addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters or begin with 6 only because Masters unreasonally withfulled water of service and processible was finded as the court of scars Masters unreasonally withfulled water of service long long that the court of service of service of service of service of service of summons. Masters stowage service, Masters' water of service of summons on Masters' service, and masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiter request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' delay in raising the objection despite hav	County of Chippewa, MI	·	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
in 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmacoutical. Thus, Fed. R. Ch. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's dients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service upon Masters, person lived invalid. Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Rhol is Mw, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction them emust be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance," Progressive Direct live. So, or Williams, 186 KE.46.337, 339 (On. L. App. 2022) (patroling lincein) Tever), inc. V. sander, 133 KE.2 dients for a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance, but in the satisfies of a sill they had in addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed or serve in W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process pown Masters, personally unisoliton in statisfied as if they had, in addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed or serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unabability of service, or service of service of service of service of service or service. Only of the Court's Case Management Order (Okt. 222, pp. 10, 16(c) billigate defendants to waive service about proper of service of	County of China and Maintine	1.10 45000)A/-:t- 0 1	NI-	13/1/2023 14/1-7	NI-			
each affidativit of service, it is noter that the person servicel identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event than X&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event than V&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event than V&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event than V&L's clients for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohlo law, "for a court to acquire purishficial to satisficial to the must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance, jor even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had in addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. 2018. The court of the death of the dea	County of Chippewa, Michigan	1:18-op-45066	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Mylan	No			
	County of Delta, MI	1:18-op-45067	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
JUDITY OF DELIG. INTURING I 1.10 TOUT 4.007 TWENT & LUXEROUTE FIND I 1.2/1/2022/INVIVIII INV	County of Delta, Michigan	1:18-op-45067	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Mylan	No		1	,

			-						
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half
									years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was
									improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service
									absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and
									forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was
									named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
City of Escanaba, MI	1:18-op-45068	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Escanaba, Michigan	1:18-op-45068	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		No	Tes	3/21/2019	planitins.
City of Escanaba, Wilchigan	1.16-0p-43000	Levin Papantonio	NO	12/1/2022	Iviyiaii	INO			
Marion County (MS)	1:18-op-45075	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/25/2019	
		Levin Papantonio						, , , , ,	
Marion County, MS	1:18-op-45075	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	7/25/2019	
		Levin Papantonio							
Mobile, AL	1:18-op-45076	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of Polk, Texas	1:18-op-45077	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of Polk, Texas	1:18-op-45077	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
Dalla Carrata TV	4:40 45077	Harrison Davis Morrison		2/46/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	N-			
Polk County, TX	1:18-op-45077	Jones	No	2/10/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive
					Amneal				Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and
		Harrison Davis Morrison			Pharmaceuticals of				The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that
The County of Polk, Texas	1:18-op-45077	Jones	No	2/16/2023	New York, LLC	Yes			service was not properly performed.
					,				On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive
									Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and
		Harrison Davis Morrison			Amneal				The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that
The County of Polk, Texas	1:18-op-45077	Jones	No	2/26/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			service was not properly performed.
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
Polk County, TX	1:18-op-45077	Jones	No	2/16/2023		No			
County of Lorain (OH)	1:18-op-45078	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Lorain, Ohio	1:18-op-45078	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Trumbull v. Purdue Pharma L.P.	1.10 00 45070	Napoli Shkolaik	Vos		Value Drug	Vos	Voc	2/15/2022	
County of Trumbull, Ohio	1:18-op-45079 1:18-op-45079	Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik	Yes Yes		Value Drug Hikma	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	2/15/2023 2/16/2023	
County of Trumbull, Offic	1.10-0h-430/3	тароп эпконик	103	1	TIINIII	103	163	2/ 10/ 2023	

Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No 12/1/20								T	1	1
In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. C.U. P. 4(1)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters by presumed valid. What's more, in the man three and a half years since, Master has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service was deficiently in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquisited into the must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance," If progressive Direct tans, 23 N. E. 2d 606, 610 (0h. 1956)), it is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even this stand only properly vexecuted service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had, in addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withfield waiver of service as province Both Fact, P. 4(4)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, % 6(1) obligate defendants to varioe service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Master's due for summons. Masters showwhiled these rich without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters was process server. This refusal to waive service, Master's due of service of summons. Masters storewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters was process server. This refusal to waive service, Master's due of service of summons. Masters store was all the service and procedure of service and the service and procedure of service and the service service and	County of Saginaw, MI	1:18-op-45082	Weitz & Luxenberg	No			Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
each affidavit of service, It is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(1)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed void. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper; in the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service was improper; in the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service was improper; in the unlikely event that W&L's ev	County of Saginaw, Michigan	1:18-op-45082	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 M	ylan	No			
ounty of Genesee, Michigan 1:18-op-45083 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No	County of Genesee, MI	1:18-op-45083	_	No			Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
	County of Genesee, Michigan	1:18-op-45083	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 M	ylan	No			

	1	T	<u>, </u>	T		,		<u> </u>	
City of Detroit, MI City of Detroit, Michigan	1:18-op-45084 1:18-op-45084	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No No	12/1/2022 12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical Mylan	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Detroit, Michigan	1:18-op-45084	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
					Masters				In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Macomb, MI	1:18-op-45085	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
County of Macomb, Michigan	1:18-op-45085	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Surry County (NC)	1:18-op-45086	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Voc	Voc	9/9/2019	
Metropolitan Government of	1.10-υμ-43000	nanerty	163		JIVI JIIIIUI	Yes	Yes	3/3/2013	
Nashville and Davidson County									
(TN) Metropolitan Government of	1:18-op-45088	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes		Waiver of service filed on docket 3/20/2023.
Nashville and Davidson									
County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45088	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Mylan	No			
Metropolitan Government of									
-	1:18-op-45088	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Hikma	No			
						•	•	·	

Randy Seal, Duly Elected Sheriff of Washington Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Washington Parish Sheriff's Office and the Washington Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes		SHC Not Pursuing
Randy Seal, Duly Elected Sheriff of Washington Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Washington Parish Sheriff's Office and the Washington Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No		
Randy Seal, Sheriff of Washington Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023		No		
Randy Seal, Washington Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale			
	1:18-op-45093	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Drug	Yes Yes	12/4/2019	
Seal (Sheriff of Washington		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
**	1:18-op-45093	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No		
Seal, Randy (Washington		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		. /0 /0 00				
Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45093	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No		
Rosebud Sioux Tribe	1:18-op-45095				Dakota Drug	No		The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate	1:18-op-45095				Dakota Drug	No		The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe	1:18-op-45095				Dakota Drug	No		The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
		Levin Papantonio						
Amite County (MS)	1:18-op-45097	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes Yes	7/22/2019	
Ivy Woods, Duly Elected Sheriff of Jefferson Davis Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Jefferson Davis Parish Sheriff's Office and the Jefferson Davis Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes		SHC Not Pursuing
Ivy Woods, Duly Elected Sheriff of Jefferson Davis Parish, in his Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Jefferson Davis Parish Sheriff's Office and the Jefferson Davis Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45099	LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No		
	1:18-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No		
Woods (Sheriff of Jefferson Davis Parish), LA	1:18-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	1 /2 /2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No		
Woods, Ivy (Jefferson Davis	1.10-0h-43033	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	INO	1/3/2023	Januoz/ Noval tis			
	1:18-op-45099	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No		
. Enditioned in a Education of	12.20 OP 13033	1	1	1, 3, 2023			<u>l</u>	

Cecil County, Maryland v.				<u> </u>	<u> </u>	T		1	
Amerisourcebergen Drug		Levin Papantonio							
Corp., et al.	1:18-op-45100	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
County of Anoka, MN	1:18-op-45101	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes			Not Named in Complaint
County of Roscommon, MI	1:18-op-45102	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/202	Masters 2 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance(.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Roscommon, MI	1:18-op-45102	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	piaintitts.
Michigan	1:18-op-45102	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	2 Mylan	No			
		Levin Papantonio		, ,	,				
City of Woburn (MA)	1:18-op-45103	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
l					Masters				indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Marquette, MI	1:18-op-45104	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.

	T		1		T	1	1	T	
County of Crawford, MI County of Crawford, Michigan City of Methuen (MA)	1:18-op-45105 1:18-op-45105	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No No Yes	12/1/2022	KVK-Tech	Yes No Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
					Associated Pharmacies				
Haywood County, TN	1:18-op-45107	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Voc	Yes	3/22/2021	
County of Leelanau, MI	1:18-op-45111	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to service of summons. Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as
County of Leelanau, Michigan	1:18-op-45111	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

	T	<u> </u>			1	T	Т	1	
County of Mason, MI	1:18-op-45112	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Mason, Michigan	1:18-op-45112		No	12/1/2022		No	163	3/21/2013	pourting.
County of Manistee, MI	1:18-op-45113	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	42/4/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical		Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
	·	J				Yes	163	3/21/2013	promiting.
County of Manistee, Michigan	1:18-op-45113	Weitz & Luxenberg Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Polk County, IA	1:18-op-45116	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Polk County, IA	1:18-OP-45116 (S.D. lo		No	11/18/2022	Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	6/2/2019	
Brown County, WI, et al	1:18-op-45117	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Brown County, Wisconsin, et al.		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.				SHC Not Pursuing

Application Control										
March Control March Contro										
Mark Calculy, 16 28 of 4512 Mark Calculy, 16 Mark Calculy, 17 Mark Calculy, 16 Mark Calculy, 17						Associated				
Control Control (1985) Control (1985						Pharmacies				
Control Cont			Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
March 1986	Union County, MS	1:18-op-45120	·	Yes		•	Yes	Yes	7/25/2019	
Caster of Annie Nation 14 a of 4521 12 a of 1522 15 a of 1525 15 a of 1			,							
Caster of Annie Nation 14 a of 4521 12 a of 1522 15 a of 1525 15 a of 1	Board of Commissioners of the		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Secretary Control Co		1:18-op-45121		No	11/18/2022	Mylan	No			
Marcocarde 1, de					,,	,				
Section Sect	Adair County, IA, et al.	1:18-op-45122		No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
March Care, 10 2159-6122 De C. De C. De De De De De De De D	industrial of desiring and desired				,,					
Service (London Education 1989-2013 Other & Markel, 1199-2016 Other & Markel,	Adair County, IA	1:18-OP-45122 (S.D. Jo		No	11/18/2022	Hv-Vee	Yes	Yes	6/2/2019	
Semination From 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2		· '								A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Encargo Control 24 64 522 Comma Abridad 27 66 1/2/0028 67 67 67 67 67 67 67 6										
Source Caste 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1										
Martinest Control 18-pp-63-19 Martinest Desired Martinest										
Martin M	Jennings country, in	1.10 op 45151		110	1/3/2023	marvior	110			71113 Was originally served on 12/17/2010
	Williamson County (TN)	1·18-on-45134	•	Ves		IM Smith	Vec	Vec	1/20/2021	
Control Control 11.5 ap. 45.15 Nature Sec. No. N	vviiidiii30ii Codiity (114)	1.10 ор 43134	•	103		JIVI SITIICII	103	103	1/20/2021	
Married Parkers Teas 136 pp 62199 Series 160 276/0003 Series 160 276/0003 Section Miseration 160 Section Miseration 16	Greene County (TN)	1:18-on-45136		Voc		IM Smith	Voc	νως	3/2/2023	
County of Joseph Ty 150 of 1513 150 of	Greene county (114)	1.16-0p-43130		163		JIVI SIIIILII	163	163	3/2/2023	
County of Brown, Tr. 115, 6p. 45130 Services Devis Morrison No. 2/18/2003 Services Devis Morrison	County of Janes Toyas	1:19 on 4E120		No	2/16/2022	Mulan	No			
County 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	County of Jones, Texas	1.10-0p-45159		INO	2/10/2023	iviyiaii	INO			
Control of Jermin, TX	County of Janes TV	1:19 on 4E120		No	2/16/2022	Candaz/Novartis	No			
County of Direct, No. 1920 43.09 45.10 45.00	County of Jones, 1X	1:18-0p-45139		INO	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	INO			
Carlo, Libert of Verrorm Parish Libert Officer of the Verrorm Parish Libert Officer of the Verrorm Parish Libert Officer of the Verrorm Parish User Carlo, Libert Sherrif John Carlo, May Refer Sherrif John Carlo, May	County of James TV	1.10 45120		No	2/10/2022	Indivior	No			
Parable 1.1 1.50-0-55.00 1.1		1:18-0p-45139		INO	2/16/2023	maivior	INO			
Sammous Harring Costroy Sammous Harring		1.10 45140		NI-	4 /2 /2022	Canda - /Navartia	N-			
Shareff Columbiane 1.15-op-15.140 LC No 1/3/2003 No No 1/3/2003 No No No No No No No N		1:18-0p-45140		NO	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	NO			
Delic Craft, Duly Elected Sheriff Ol Version Partials, Init Elected Sheriff Old P	-	1.10 am 45140		No	1/2/2022	Hilma	No			
of Vernom Partich, In His Capacity as Officer as Officer of the Vernom Partich Sheriff's Officer and the Vernom Partich Sheriff's Officer and the Vernom Partich Sheriff's Officer and the Vernom Partich Island Participation (Capacity and Officer as Officer and Participation (Capacity and Officer and Participation (Cap	Sheriii , Louisiana)	1:18-0p-45140	LLC	NO	1/3/2023	ПІКІПА	NO			
of Vernom Partich, In His Capacity as Officer as Officer of the Vernom Partich Sheriff's Officer and the Vernom Partich Sheriff's Officer and the Vernom Partich Sheriff's Officer and the Vernom Partich In His Capacity as Officer as Officer and the Vernom Partich In His Capacity as Officer as Officer and the Vernom Partich In His Capacity as Officer as Officer and the Vernom Partich In His Capacity as Officer as Officer and the Vernom Partich In His Capacity as Officer as Officer and the Vernom Partich In His Capacity as Officer as Officer and the Vernom Partich In His Capacity as Officer and the Vernom Partich In His Capacity as Officer and the Vernom Partich In His Capacity as Officer and In His Capacit	John Croft Duly Floated Shoriff									
Capacity so Office 1 of Office and the Vernor Parish Law Search 2 of Office and the Vernor Parish Sheriff C Office and the Vernor Parish Law Search 2 of Office and the Vernor Parish Law Search 2 office and the Aleman Parish Sheriff I Law Search 2 office and the Aleman Parish Sheriff I Law Search 2 office and the Aleman Parish Law Search 2 office and the Aleman Par										
The Vermor Particle Street (Fig. 1) Simmors Hanky Corroy, No 1/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes SHC Not Pursing										
Office and the Vermore Parish Use of Service Micror (18 op 45 140) Use of Service Micror (
Law Enforcement District 128 op 45140 LIC No 1/3/2023 Paramaceuticals, Inc. Ves SHC Not Pursuing			Cina na ana Manda Canana			A				
Don Craft, Duly Elected Sheriff of Vernor Parish, in His Capacity as Office: To Office and the Vernor Parish Sheriff of Allen Parish, In His Capacity as Officer & Office and the Vernor Parish Sheriff of Allen Parish, In His Capacity as Officer & Office of the Allen Parish, In His Capacity as Officer & Office of the Allen Parish, In His Capacity as Officer & Office of the Allen Parish, In His Capacity as Office		4.40 454.40			4 /2 /2022		lv.			
of Vermon Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Vermon Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) 218-op-45140	Law Enforcement District	1:18-0p-45140	LLC	NO	1/3/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC NOT Pursuing
of Vermon Parish, in His Capacity as Office Pt 2010tion of the Vermon Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) 1:8-op-45140	John Craft Duly Floated Shoriff									
Capacity as Officer Ex Officion of the Vernor Parish Sherriff's Office and the Vernor Parish Sherriff of										
the Vermon Parish Sheriff's Office and the Vermon Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) 1.18-op-45140										
Office and the Vernon Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) 118-0-45140 LLC No 1/3/2023 JM Smith No 1/3/2023 JM Smi										
Law Enforcement District (LA) 1.18-op-45140 LC No 1/3/2023 M Smith No No 1/3/2023 M Smith No No 1/3/2023 M Smith No No 1/3/2023 M Smith No No 1/3/2023 M Smith No No 1/3/2023 M Smith No No No No No No No No			Cimamana Hanly Consoy							
John Craft, Sheriff of Vernon Parish Louisiana 1:8-op-45140 LC LC No 1/3/2023 Mylan No No No No No No No N		1.10 45140		NI-	4 /2 /2022	INA Comitte	N-			
Parish, Louislana 1:18-op-45:140 LLC No 1/3/2023 Mylan No Image: Control of the Allen Parish of the Control of the Allen Parish in His C		1:18-0p-45140		NO	1/3/2023	JIVI SMITH	NO			
Simmons Hanly Conroy, No 1/3/2003 Drug No No 1/3/2003 Drug No No No No No No No N	I	4.40 454.40		N.	4 /2 /2022					
Sheriff 1.18-op-45140 LIC No 1/3/2023 Drug Yes Yes 1/1/2019 Sheriff Charles Char		1:18-op-45140		NO	1/3/2023		NO			
Douglas Hebert, III, Sheriff of Allen Parish, Louisiana (18-op-45142) LLC No 1/3/2023 Mylan No 1/3/2029 Pres Parish Louisiana (18-op-45142) LLC No 1/3/2023 Pres Pres Parish Louisiana (18-op-45142) LLC No 1/3/2023 Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres		4.40 454.40		N.	4 /2 /2022		lv.	W.	44/4/2040	
Allen Parish, Louisiana 1:18-op-45142 LLC No 1/3/2023 Mylan No Louisiana Wholesale Douglas Hebert, III, Allen Parish Shreiffs 1:18-op-45142 LLC No 1/3/2023 Drug Yes Yes 11/1/2019 Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, In His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish is North Experiment Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal Amneal Amneal		1:18-0p-45140		INO	1/3/2023	טועg	res	162	11/1/2019	
Douglas Hebert, III, Allen Parish Sheriff 1:18-op-45142 LLC No 1/3/2023 Drug Ves Ves 11/1/2019 Louisiana Wholesale Ves Ves Ves 11/1/2019 LLC No 1/3/2023 Drug Ves Ves Ves 11/1/2019 Drug LLC No 1/3/2023 Drug Ves Ves Ves 11/1/2019 Drug LLC No 1/3/2023 Drug Ves Ves Ves 11/1/2019 Drug LLC No 1/3/2023 Drug Drug LLC No 1/3/2023 Drug Drug Drug	_	1.10 151.10		NI-	4 10 10 5 = =	Mulan	N-			
Parish Sherriff 1:18-op-45142 LLC No 1/3/2023 Drug Yes Yes 11/1/2019 Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sherriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Office of the Allen Parish Sherriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement District (IA) Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sherriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Office of the Allen Parish Simmons Hanly Conroy, District (IA) Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sherriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish Sherriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal	· ·	1:18-op-45142		NO	1/3/2023		NO			
Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, In His Capacity as Officer Ex Office of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) District (LA) District (LA) Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, In His Capacity as Officer Ex Office of the Allen Parish Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC No 1/3/2023 JM Smith No Amneal					4 /0 /0000			.,	44/4/2040	
Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer EX Office of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) 1:18-op-45142 LLC No 1/3/2023 JM Smith No Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer EX Office of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal Amneal		1:18-op-45142	LLC	NO	1/3/2023	Drug	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
in His Capacity as Office Ex Office of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Office of the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal										
Office of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, No 1/3/2023 JM Smith No 1/3/2023 JM Smith No Amneal										
Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, No 1/3/2023 JM Smith No Amneal										
Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) 1:18-op-45142 LLC No 1/3/2023 JM Smith No Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal										
District (LA) 1:18-op-45142 LLC No 1/3/2023 JM Smith No Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal			Cimmons Usualis Comm							
Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal					4 /0 /0000					
Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal		1:18-op-45142	LLC	INO	1/3/2023	JIVI SMITH	INO			
in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal										
Officio of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal										
Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal										
Parish Law Enforcement Simmons Hanly Conroy, Amneal										
District 1:18-op-45142 LLC No 1/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes SHC Not Pursuing										
	District	1:18-op-45142	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing

	T	_			1	1		T	
Hebert (Sheriff of Allen Parish),		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
LA	1:18-op-45142	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Herbert, Douglas III (Allen		Simmons Hanly Conroy,	112	_, _,					
Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45142	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Richardson (Sheriff of Sabine		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:18-op-45143	LLC	No	1 /2 /2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
	1:18-0p-45143		NO	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	INO			
Richardson, Ronald (Sabine		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45143	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
r drish sherm , Esuisiana,	1.10 00 13113		110	1,3,2023	Tilking	110			
Ronald Richardson, Duly									
Elected Sheriff of Sabine									
Parish, in His Capacity as									
Officer Ex Officio of the Sabine									
Parish Sheriff's Office and the									
Sabine Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Enforcement District	1:18-op-45143	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
	·								
Ronald Richardson, Duly									
Elected Sheriff of Sabine					1	1			
Parish, in His Capacity as		1							
Officer Ex Officio of the Sabine					1	1			
Parish Sheriff's Office and the					1	1			
Sabine Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
		1							
	1:18-op-45143	LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Ronald Richardson, Sabine		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale				
	1:18-op-45143		No	1/2/2022		Vos	Vos	11/22/2010	
	1.10-UP-45143	LLC	INU	1/3/2023	Didg	Yes	Yes	11/22/2019	
Ronald Richardson, Sheriff of		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Sabine Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45143	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
			112	_, _, _,	,				
		Levin Papantonio							
Catawba County (NC)	1:18-op-45145	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
		Levin Papantonio							
F (AAC)	1.10 45147		V		IN A Consider	V	V	7/22/2010	
Forrest County (MS)	1:18-op-45147	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
		Levin Papantonio							
Forrest County, MS	1:18-op-45147	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
Torrest county, IVIS	1:10 OP +31+7	Rairerty	163		WIIIII DIXIC	163	103	7/22/2013	
City of Alexandria, IN, et al.	1:18-op-45151	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			PFS's were originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/18/2018
			l.,	. /0 /0 000		1			
City of Alexandria, Indiana et al.	1:18-op-45151	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			PFS's were originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/18/2018
City of Alexandria, Indiana, et									
al	1:18-op-45151	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			PFS's were originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/18/2018
	1.18-0p-43131	Correir & Ivialau, EEF	110	1/3/2023	Aillieai	110			1133 were originally served on 12/17/2010 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/10/2010
City of Alexandria, Indiana;									
City of Elwood, Indiana;									
	1:18-op-45151	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			PFS's were originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/18/2018
	1.10-0h-42121	Corieri & ividiau, LLF	140	1/3/2023	iviyiaii	140	+		1133 Well Oliginary Served on 12/17/2010 and Supplemented for Alexandria on 12/10/2010
City of Alexandria, IN, City of									
Elwood, IN, and Madison									
	1:18-op-45151	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			PFS's were originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/18/2018
County, IIV	1.10-0h-42121	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	INO	1/3/2023	maivioi	INO	+		1133 were originally served on 12/17/2010 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/16/2018
		Levin Papantonio							
Baldwin County, AL	1:18-op-45152	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/16/2020	
,,		Levin Papantonio	†		1	1			
								l	
Hancock County (TN)	1:18-op-45153	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/8/2023	
lay Bussell Duly sleeted Charite					1	1			
Jay Russell, Duly elected Sheriff									
of Ouachita Parish in his									
official capacity as Sheriff &					1	1			
the Ouachita Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			1	1			
Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45154	LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
lov Bussell, Duby Flantad Charge									
Jay Russell, Duly Elected Sheriff									
of Ouachita Parish, in His									
Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of					1	1			
the Ouachita Parish Sheriff's									
Office and the Ouachita Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal	1			
	1:18-op-45154	LLC	No	1/2/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
	1.10-0h-43134		110	1/3/2023		100	+		one neer distants
Jay Russell, Ouachita Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale				
Sheriff	1:18-op-45154	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Drug	Yes	Yes	12/4/2019	
		1	1	, -,		· ·		<u> </u>	

			T						
Jay Russell, Sheriff of Ouachita		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45154	LLC	No		1/3/2023 Mylan	No			
Russell (Sheriff of Ouachita		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Parish), LA	1:18-op-45154	LLC	No		1/3/2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Russell, Jay (Ouachita Sheriff,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Louisiana)	1:18-op-45154	LLC	No		1/3/2023 Hikma	No			
		Levin Papantonio							
City of Revere, MA	1:18-op-45155	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
City of Revere, MA	1:18-op-45155	Levin Papantonio Raffert	ty Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
Lake County, Indiana	1:18-op-45156	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Lake County, Indiana	1:18-op-45156	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Lake County, Indiana	1:18-op-45156	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Lake County, IN	1:18-op-45156	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Marshall County, IN	1:18-op-45157	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Marshall County, Indiana	1:18-op-45157	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Marshall County, Indiana	1:18-op-45157	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Marshall County, Indiana	1:18-op-45157	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Marshall County, IN	1:18-op-45157	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
					, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				0 - 1 1
City of Connersville, IN, et al.	1:18-op-45159	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Connersville, Indiana et			1		-, -,	1			
al	1:18-op-45159	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Hikma	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Connersville, Indiana, et		Conen & Ividida, ELi	140		1/3/2023 111/114	140			113 was originary served on 12/17/2010
al	1:18-op-45159	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Amneal	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
ai.	1.16-0p-43133	Conen & Maiau, EE	140		1/3/2023 Allilledi	NO			113 was originally served on 12/17/2010
City of Connersville, Indiana;									
Fayette County, Indiana	1:18-op-45159	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Mylan	No			DEC was originally somed on 12/17/2019
City of Connersville and	1.16-0p-45159	Correir & Ivialau, ELP	INO		1/3/2023 Wiylali	INO			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Fayette County, IN	1:18-op-45159	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		1/3/2023 Indivior	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Fayette County, IN	1:18-0p-45159	Levin Papantonio	INO		Louisiana Wholesale				PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Boton Bougo Louisiana	1.10 on 45160	Rafferty	Vos				Vos	2/28/2022	
City of Baton Rouge, Louisiana	1:18-0p-45160	•	Yes		Drug	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023	
Foot Poten Power IA	1.10 45160	Levin Papantonio	V		Wine Dist	V	V	2/22/2024	
East Baton Rouge, LA	1:18-op-45160	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	3/22/2021	
(70)	4.40 45464	Levin Papantonio	,,,,,		10.4.6		w.	2/22/2024	
Johnson County (TN)	1:18-op-45164	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	D f 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Candler County (GA)	1:18-op-45165	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 4/3/20.
		Blasingame, Burch,			10 /10 /0000	<u>.</u>			
Candler County, Georgia	1:18-op-45165	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Candler County, Georgia	1:18-op-45165	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Candler County, Georgia	1:18-op-45165	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Amneal	No			
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Hikma on
County of Huerfano, Colorado	1:18-op-45168	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Hikma	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23. The request was denied by Hikma.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on
County of Huerfano, Colorado	1:18-op-45168	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of Clay, Texas	1:18-op-45169	Jones	No		2/16/2023 Mylan	No			
	·	Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of Clay, TX	1:18-op-45169	Jones	No		2/16/2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of Clay, TX	1:18-op-45169	Jones	No		2/16/2023 Indivior	No			
· / · · · · / / · · ·		1		L	,		<u> </u>	<u>L</u>	

					Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a
					different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548).
					Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good
					cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the
					Waivers be signed at the present time. API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847) ●②n April 14, 2019, an email was
					sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.
					• n June 3, 2019, another email was forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of
					Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
					•Dn June 4, 2019, the email was acknowledged by Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq., requesting information and we responded
County of Onondaga, New					•On June 5, 2019, Waivers were returned for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC only.
York v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45170	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Ir	nc. Yes In Process	•On June 9, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:18-op-45170
		Eriodman Davrio 9			PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
City of Dora (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C. No	3/3/2023 JM Smith	Yes In Process	reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
					PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
City of Jacpar (AL)	1:19 on 45171	Friedman, Dazzio &	2/2/2022 INA Smith	Voc. In Drococc	reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
City of Jasper (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Zulanas, P.C. No	3/3/2023 JM Smith	Yes In Process	before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

		T	T T	Т		T		
City of Sumiton (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
County of Marion, Alabama; County of Pickens, Alabama; County of Walker, Alabama; City of Dora, Alabama; City of Jasper, Alabama; City of Sumiton, Alabama	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Marion County (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Marion County, Alabama et al.	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Pickens County (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

Walker County (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Counties of Marion, Pickens, and Walker, AL, and Cities of Dora, Jasper, and Sumiton, AL	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Skagit County, Washington	1:18-op-45173	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
								77 - 17 - 20 - 20	
	4.40 45470	William Dallada al La D			Amneal	V		2/44/2022	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Skagit County, Washington	1:18-op-45173	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Skagit County, Washington	1:18-op-45173	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Municipality of Guayanilla,		Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson			Amneal				
Puerto Rico	1:18-op-45176	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
Arizona Municipal Risk					Associated Pharmacies Inc/American				
Retention Pool	1:18-op-45178	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
Arizona Municipal Risk Retention Pool	1:18-op-45178	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Arizona Municipal Risk								7,7,72	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Retention Pool, Arizona	1:18-op-45178	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Coffoo County Al	1:19 or 45193	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Voc		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Vos	Voc	12/30/2020	
Coffee County, AL	1:18-op-45182	namenty	Yes		Associated FilatifiaCles	162	Yes	12/30/2020	
		Levin Papantonio			Associated Pharmacies Inc/American				
Stokes County, NC	1:18-op-45185	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
Mobile County, AL	1:18-op-45186	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	

			_		•				
Edrick Soileau, Duly Elected									
Sheriff of Evangeline Parish, in									
His Capacity as Officer Ex									
Officio of the Evangeline Parish									
Sheriff's Office and the									
Evangeline Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Enforcement District	1:18-op-45189	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
				, -,	,				
Edrick Soileau, Duly Elected									
Sheriff of Evangeline Parish, in									
His Capacity as Officer Ex									
Officio of the Evangeline Parish									
Sheriff's Office and the									
Evangeline Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
_	1.10 am 4F100	LLC	No :	1 /2 /2022	JM Smith	No			
	1:18-op-45189		NO .	1/3/2023		INO			
Edrick Soileau, Evangeline		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale				
Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45189	LLC	No :	1/3/2023	Drug	Yes	Yes	11/22/2019	
Edrick Soileau, Sheriff of		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
I -	1:18-op-45189	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Soileau (Sheriff of Evangeline	5.255	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	-	, -, -023	1	-			
	1.10 am 45400		No.	1 /2 /2022	Condon/No:	No			
	1:18-op-45189	LLC	No :	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No	+	-	
Soileau, Edrick (Evangeline		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45189	LLC	No :	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Biana Carreta Markinston	1.10 45105	Kallan Bahnhaalu I I B	V		11:1	V	V		
Pierce County, Washington	1:18-op-45195	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
		Levin Papantonio							
Tuscaloosa County, AL	1:18-op-45196	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/18/2020	
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA							
Municipality of Sabana		Milberg Coleman Bryson			Amneal				
1									
Grande, Puerto Rico, et al.	1:18-op-45197	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
Municipality of Sabana		Sanders Phillips							
Grande, Puerto Rico;		Grossman, LLC AKA							
Municipality of Cayey, Puerto		Milberg Coleman Bryson							
	1.10 on 45107	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
NICO	1:18-op-45197	Prillips Grossman, LLC	res		iviyiaii	163	III PTOCESS		
		1							
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA							
Municipality of Sabana Grande		Milberg Coleman Bryson							
	1:18-op-45197		Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
and management of cayey, in		Levin Papantonio	1.22			. 50			
Colmo Al	1.10 an 45400		Ves		Winn Divi-	Vas	Vos	12/10/2020	
Selma, AL	1:18-op-45198	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
City of Union Springs, AL	1:18-op-45204	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Voc	Yes	12/30/2020	
City of Offion Springs, AL	1.16-0p-45204	Kallerty	res		Associated Pilatiliacies	163	res	12/30/2020	
									Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this
									case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of
									submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time.
									Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this
									defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak,
Lamar County, Alabama; City									and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service
of Vernon, Alabama; and Hal									waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel
Allred, Sheriff of Lamar		Riley & Jackson, P.C.							then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is
	1:18-op-45210		No 10,	/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	in process.
				. ,					•

Fayette County, Alabama; City of Fayette, Alabama; Byron Yerby, Alabama	1:18-op-45211	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
Montgomery County, Maryland	1:18-op-45212	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity — Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. — with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 47. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. by way of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
Montgomery County, MD	1:18-op-45212	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V.	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V., Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entities – Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. <i>See</i> Dkt. Nos. 40, 44. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiff also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V has been on notice since April 25, 2019 and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V. have been effectively cured.
City of Enterprise, AL	1:18-op-45213	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Vec	Yes	11/24/2020	
City of Ozark, AL	1:18-op-45214	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies		Yes	12/18/2020	
		Levin Papantonio							
Crockett County (TN) Town of Butler, AL	1:18-op-45215	Rafferty Frazer PLC	Yes No	1/10/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes No	Yes	3/22/2021	
	1:18-op-45216	Levin Papantonio		1/10/2023	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American				
	1:18-op-45217	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/8/2020	2.5
The Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County (GA)	1:18-op-45218	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 11/19/19.
The Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County, Georgia	1:18-op-45218	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
The Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County, Georgia	1:18-op-45218	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Unified Government of Athens- Clarke County, Georgia	1:18-op-45218	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Oconee County (GA)	1:18-op-45219	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022		Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Oconee County, Georgia	1:18-op-45219	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Oconee County, Georgia	1:18-op-45219	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Oconee County, Georgia	1:18-op-45219		No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			

	1		1	1	1	1	1		
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe	1:18-op-45220				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Mecklenburg County (NC)	1:18-op-45221	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
ineckienburg county (NC)	1.10-0μ-43221		NO	11/10/2022	Associated Pharmacies	INO			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Inc/American				
Mecklenburg County, NC	1:18-op-45221	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacie	No			
County of Haskell, Texas	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	3 Hikma	No			
Haskell County, Texas	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	3 Mylan	No			
Haskell County, TX	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	3 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
The County of Haskell, Texas	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
, ,		Harrison Davis Morrison			Amneal				On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that
The County of Haskell, Texas	1:18-op-45223	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			service was not properly performed.
Haskell County, TX	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	 	No			
City of Charleston, WV	1:18-op-45224	Motley Rice	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		As per the template filed 4/25/2018 (ECF 279-1), Plaintiff served counsel Jack Smith on behalf of Masters Pharmaceutical with the City of Charleston, WV complaint and a waiver form on 7/12/2018 at 12:58 PM. Confirmation of original service and waiver sent with curative waiver to Defense counsel's new Masters signatory.
Town of Fort Gay, WV	1:18-OP-45225	Motley Rice	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Voc	7/17/2018	Curative waiver sent to Defense counsel; Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons - instead of a Waiver of the Service of Summons - for the Town of Fort Gay, WV was signed and returned by counsel Allen Lopus on behalf of Top Rx, LLC on 7/17/2018 with the originally served Notice signed by Linda Singer on behalf of the Town of Fort Gay, WV and corresponding complaint.
Town of Fort day, wv	1.16-07-43223	Motiey Rice	Tes		ТОРКХ	ies	Yes	7/17/2018	Summers County has participated in a global settlement with regard to the State of West Virginia
Summers County Commission	1:18-OP-45226	Wooton, Davis, Hussell &	No	N/A	TopRx	Yes	No	N/A	and pursuant to MOA
	4.40 45227	Levin Papantonio			Associated Pharmacies Inc/American			42/20/2020	
Cullman County, AL	1:18-op-45227	Rafferty Harrison Davis Morrison	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
Childress County, Texas	1:18-op-45229	Jones	No	2/16/2023	3 Mylan	No			
County of Childress, Texas	1:18-op-45229	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023		No			
		Harrison Davis Morrison							
County of Childress, TX	1:18-op-45229	Jones	No	2/16/2023	3 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
									PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
Marshall County, Alabama et		Friedman, Dazzio &							reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
al.	1:18-op-45230	Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	3 Hikma	Yes	In Process		before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

	1	1			T	ı		1	
Marshall County, Alabama; City of Albertville, Alabama; City of Arab, Alabama; City of Boaz, Alabama; City of Guntersville, Alabama; Town of Douglas, Alabama; Town of Grant; Alabama	1:18-op-45230	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Marshall County, AL, Cities of Albertville, Arab, Boaz and Guntersville, AL, and Towns of Douglas and Grant, AL	1:18-op-45230	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Kings County, Washington	1:18-op-45231	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
<i>B</i> - 3-3-4,		Harrison Davis Morrison			-			-, -, -	
County of La Salle, Texas	1:18-op-45234	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
County of La Salle, Texas	1:18-op-45234	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
County of La Saile, Texas	1.16-0β-43234	Harrison Davis Morrison	+	2/10/2023	iviyiaii	140			
County of La Salle, TX	1:18-op-45234	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
The County of La Salle, Texas	1:18-op-45234	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
The County of La Salle, Texas	1:18-op-45234	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
County of La Salle, TX	1:18-op-45234	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
County of La Jane, 1A	1.10 υρ-43234	301103	1	2, 10, 2023	maivioi	1.10			
City of Bloomington, IN, et al.	1:18-op-45235	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Bloomington, Indiana	1:18-op-45235	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Bloomington, Indiana et	<u> </u>	Conten & Maiau, LLr		1/3/2023	,				1.2 May or Britain Served on 12/11/2010
al.	1:18-op-45235	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Bloomington, Indiana; Monroe County, Indiana	1:18-op-45235	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Bloomington and	1.40	0.10.1.1			115.5				056
Monroe County, IN	1:18-op-45235	Cohen & Malad, LLP Blasingame, Burch,	No	1/3/2023	inaivior	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Jeff Davis County (GA)	1:18-op-45237	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Jeff Davis County, Georgia	1:18-op-45237	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Jeff Davis County, Georgia	1:18-op-45237	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
	·	Blasingame, Burch,							
Jeff Davis County, Georgia	1:18-op-45237	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			

	T		Г	1					
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Crisp County (GA)	1:18-op-45238	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Crisp County, Georgia	1:18-op-45238	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Crisp County, Georgia	1:18-op-45238	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Crisp County, Georgia	1:18-op-45238	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
									Pursuant to the Court's Order (Docket No. 638 dtd. June 19, 2018), Plaintiff City of Lakewood
		Lowe Scott Fisher Co.,							served its PFS on liaison counsel on Dec. 13, 2018. Unknown to Plaintiff City of Lakewood,
City of Lakewood, Ohio	1:18-op-45240	LPA	No	N/A	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/21/2023	Plaintiff's liaison counsel apparently failed to file its PFS with the PFS Repository.
•	·	Levin Papantonio			,				
Pickett County (TN)	1:18-op-45242	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
, ,	P	Levin Papantonio						, , ,	
Pickett County, TN	1:18-op-45242	Rafferty	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	4/7/2021	
Theretic edunity, The	1.10 op .02 .2	Levin Papantonio	1.00		100101			1,7,2022	
Rutherford County (NC)	1:18-op-45243	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Rutherford County (NC)	1.10-0μ-43243	Ranerty	163		JIVI JIIIICII	163	163	5/11/2015	
					Associated				
					Associated				
		Lauda Donos de la			Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio	.,		Inc/American	l.,		11/00/5555	
Bullock County, AL	1:18-op-45246	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
									Plaintiff's counsel was initially unable to locate the required Request for Wavier of Service the
					Associated				Defendant. Defendant amended its Request for Waiver form on 8/19/2019 [Doc. 2491]. On
					Pharmacies				08/20/2019, Plaintiff emailed request to Defendant's counsel. Plaintiff's counsel sent follow-up
		Montgomery Ponder,			Inc/American				email and Defendant sent signed Waiver of Service on 01/13/2020. Waiver of Service filed
Clay County, AL	1:18-op-45248	LLC	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	1/13/2020	01/14/2020 [Doc. 36].
		Levin Papantonio							
Indiana County, Pennsylvania v.	1:18-op-45249	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	3/25/2021	
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Sumter County (GA)	1:18-op-45250	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
, ,	'	Blasingame, Burch,						, ,	
Sumter County, Georgia	1:18-op-45250	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
.,,		Blasingame, Burch,		, , -					
Sumter County, Georgia	1:18-op-45250	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
cumer county, ccorgia	1.10 Op 43230	Blasingame, Burch,	1.10	12/11/2022					
Sumter County, Georgia	1:18-op-45250	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
,, ,	1:18-op-45254	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	12/14/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Sandusky County Board of	1.16-0p-43234	Napoli Silkolilik	163		iviyiaii	163	ies	2/13/2023	
	1:18-op-45254	Napoli Shkolnik	Voc		Prescription Supply	Vos	Voc	2/13/2023	
, ,	1.16-0p-45254	пароп знконик	Yes		Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/15/2025	
Sandusky County Board of	4.40 45354	No. of Children			1111			2/44/2022	
Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45254	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Sandusky County Board of					Amneal				
Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45254	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Rutherford County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45258	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Hikma	No			
Rutherford County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45258	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Mylan	No			
Williams (Sheriff of East Carroll		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Parish), LA	1:18-op-45259	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Williams, Wydette (East Carroll		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:18-op-45259	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
•				, , , , , ,					
Wydette Williams, Duly									
Elected Sheriff of East Carroll									
Parish, in His Capacity as									
Officer Ex Officio of the East									
Carroll Parish Sheriff's Office									
	Ī	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		i .	Amneal	1	i	i	1
and the East Carroll Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45259	LLC	No		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.				SHC Not Pursuing

	1	1	1		T	1			,
Wydette Williams, Duly									
Elected Sheriff of East Carroll									
Parish, in His Capacity as									
Officer Ex Officio of the East									
Carroll Parish Sheriff's Office									
and the East Carroll Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:18-op-45259	LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Wydette Williams, East Carroll	1.10 ор 43233	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	110	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale	110			
	1:18-op-45259	LLC	No	1/3/2023		Yes	Yes	11/22/2019	
T drish Sherm	1.10-0p-43233	LLC	140	1/3/2023	Diug	163	163	11/22/2013	
NA (d - th - NA (illians - Chaniff - f		Ciarana and Hamby Carana							
Wydette Williams, Sheriff of	4.40 45250	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		4 /2 /2022					
East Carroll Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45259	LLC	No	1/3/2023	siviyian	No			
Jerry L. Philley, Duly Elected									
Sheriff of West Carroll Parish,									
in His Capacity as Officer Ex									
Officio of the West Carroll									
Parish Sheriff's Office and the									
West Carroll Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Enforcement District	1:18-op-45260	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
					,				
Jerry L. Philley, Duly Elected									
Sheriff of West Carroll Parish,									
in His Capacity as Officer Ex									
Officio of the West Carroll									
Parish Sheriff's Office and the									
West Carroll Parish Law		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45260	LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Jerry L. Philley, Sheriff of West		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Carroll Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45260	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Jerry Philley, West Carroll		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale				
Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45260	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Drug	Yes	Yes	12/4/2019	
Philey, Jerry (West Carroll	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:18-op-45260	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Blasingame, Burch,		, , , , , ,					Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Oglethorpe County (GA)	1:18-op-45262	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	IM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
ogiethorpe county (Grt)	1.10 op 45202	Blasingame, Burch,	110	12/11/2022	SIVI SIIIICII	163	163	1/23/2013	Trumbin med the waret with the court on 2/3/23.
Oglethorpe County, Georgia	1:18-op-45262	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hilma	No			
Ogiethorpe County, Georgia	1.16-0p-45262	Blasingame, Burch,	INO	12/14/2022	ПКШа	INU			
Orloth and a County County	1.10 45262	_	NI-	12/11/2022)	N-			
Oglethorpe County, Georgia	1:18-op-45262	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	iviyian	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Oglethorpe County, Georgia	1:18-op-45262	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
		Levin Papantonio							
Caldwell County (NC)	1:18-op-45263	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
									As per the template filed 4/25/2018 (ECF 279-1), Plaintiff served counsel Jack Smith on behalf of
									Masters Pharmaceutical with the City of Saint Albans, WV complaint and a waiver form on
					Masters				7/12/2018 at 1:58 PM. Confirmation of original service and waiver sent with curative waiver to
City of Saint Albans, WV	1:18-op-45269	Motley Rice	Yes		Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		Defense counsel's new Masters signatory.
	1:18-op-45273	LCHB	No	3/14/2023		No			
	1:18-op-45273	LCHB	No	3/14/2023		No			
,,	· - · - · ·	Levin Papantonio		-, ,					
Randolph County (NC)	1:18-op-45275	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
	OP 13273	Simmons Hanly Conroy,						-,,,	+
Barron County, WI et al	1:18-op-45277	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
barron County, wriet at	1.10-0p-432//	LLC	INU	11/10/2022	VAV-1601	INU		+	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,	l	11/10/2027	Amneal	l.,			and the second s
Barron County, Wisconsin	1:18-op-45277	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
									Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have
		Bossier & Associates,							re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does
Clarke County (MS)	1:18-op-45278	PLLC	No	2/14/2023	JM Smith	Yes	No		not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
		<u></u>							

			<u> </u>			<u> </u>		
Clarke County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45278	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Hikma	No			Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Clarke County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45278	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Amneal	No			Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
		Bossier & Associates,						Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does
Clarke County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45278	PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Mylan	No			not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Clarke County, MS	1:18-op-45278	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Clarka Causty MC	1.10 on 45270	Bossier & Associates,	No	2/14/2022 Indivior	No			Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does
Clarke County, MS	1:18-op-45278	PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Indivior	No			not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Philadelphia (MS)	1:18-op-45279	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023 JM Smith	Yes	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
city of Finiadcipina (Wis)	1.10 op 43273	T EEC	NO .	2/14/2023 3141 31111111	163	110		incertain against ans manicipar nument, and anas, the case can be remed in required.
City of Philadelphia, Mississippi	1:19 on 45270	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Mylan	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
city of Filliadelphia, Mississippi	1.18-0p-43279	FLEC	NO	2/14/2023 Wylan	NO	NO		not run aganist uns municipai riamun, and thus, the case can be remed it required.
City of Philadelphia, MS	1:18-op-45279	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
city of Filliadelphia, ivis	1.18-0p-43279	FLEC	NO	2/14/2023 3811002/140481 (13	NO	NO		not run aganist uns municipai riamun, anu tiius, the case can be remeu ii requireu.
		Bossier & Associates,						Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does
·	1:18-op-45279	PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Indivior	No	No		not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
LaPorte County, IN	1:18-op-45280	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No No	1/3/2023 Sandoz/Novartis 1/3/2023 Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
_aPorte County, Indiana _aPorte County, Indiana	1:18-op-45280 1:18-op-45280	Cohen & Malad, LLP Cohen & Malad, LLP	No No	1/3/2023 Amneai 1/3/2023 Hikma	No No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
LaPorte County, Indiana	1:18-op-45280	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023 Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
LaPorte County, IN	1:18-op-45280	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023 Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
				Amneal				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
City of Rome, Georgia, et al.	1:18-op-45282	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
muin County (CA)	1.10 an 45303	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 INA Smith	No			
rwin County (GA)	1:18-op-45283	Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	No			
rwin County, Georgia	1:18-op-45283	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						
rwin County, Georgia	1:18-op-45283	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
rwin County, Georgia	1:18-op-45283	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Cook County (GA)	1:18-op-45284	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23.
Cook County, Georgia	1:18-op-45284	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Hikma	No			
,, ,		Blasingame, Burch,						
Cook County, Georgia	1:18-op-45284	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Mylan	No			
Cook County, Georgia	1:18-op-45284	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Amneal	No			
<u> </u>		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Hall County (GA)	1:18-op-45286	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Hall County, Georgia	1:18-op-45286	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
			+	, , :	- 			+
rian county, coolgia		Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.		12/14/2022 Mylan				

Blasingame, Burch,		
Hall County, Georgia 1:18-op-45286 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Amneal	No	
Levin Papantonio		
Crawford County, OH 1:18-op-45288 Rafferty Yes KVK-Tech	Yes No	3/23/2023
Blasingame, Burch,		Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Madison County (GA) 1:18-op-45296 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes Yes	4/25/2019 Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Blasingame, Burch,		
Madison County, Georgia 1:18-op-45296 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Hikma	No	
Blasingame, Burch,		
Madison County, Georgia 1:18-op-45296 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan	No	
Blasingame, Burch,	NO	
Madison County, Georgia 1:18-op-45296 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Amneal	No	
Blasingame, Burch,		Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Walton County (GA) 1:18-op-45297 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes Yes	4/25/2019 Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Blasingame, Burch,		
Walton County, Georgia 1:18-op-45297 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Hikma	No	
Blasingame, Burch,		
Walton County, Georgia 1:18-op-45297 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan	No	
Blasingame, Burch,		
Walton County, Georgia 1:18-op-45297 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Amneal	No	
Levin Papantonio	1.10	
Hawkins County (TN) 1:18-op-45299 Rafferty Yes JM Smith	Yes Yes	3/22/2021
Hawkins County (11) 1:18-09-45299 Railerty Tes JM Smith	res res	3/22/2021
	l	
City of W. Lafayette, Indiana 1:18-op-45300 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Hikma	No	A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of West Lafayette, IN 1:18-op-45300 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Sandoz/No	vartis No	A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of West Lafayette, Indiana 1:18-op-45300 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Amneal	No	A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of West Lafayette, Indiana 1:18-op-45300 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Mylan	No	A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of West Lafayette, IN 1:18-op-45300 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Indivior	No	A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Simon Greenstone		,,,,
County of Camp (TX) 1:18-op-45301 Panatier, P.C. Yes JM Smith	Yes In Process	Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 3/19/2019.
Simmons Hanly Conroy,	ill Flocess	waiver of service of summons sent to course off 3/13/2015.
	l	
Black Hawk County, IA et al 1:18-op-45303 LLC No 11/18/2022 KVK-Tech	No	
Simmons Hanly Conroy,		
Black Hawk County, IA 1:18-OP-45303 (S.D. Iov LLC No 11/18/2022 Hy-Vee	Yes Yes	6/2/2019
Simmons Hanly Conroy,		
Cleveland County (NC) 1:18-op-45304 LLC No 11/18/2022 JM Smith	No	
Associated		
Pharmacies		
Simmons Hanly Conroy, Inc/America		
	Pharmacies No	
Crevelatin County, NC 1.10-00-45304 LEC NO 11/10/2022 Associated	Filatifiacies NO	
		As per the template filed 4/25/2018 (ECF 279-1), Plaintiff served counsel Jack Smith on behalf of
		Masters Pharmaceutical with the City of Logan, WV complaint and a waiver form on 7/12/2018 at
Masters Masters		10:47 AM. Confirmation of original service and waiver sent with curative waiver to Defense
City of Logan, WV 1:18-op-45317 Motley Rice Yes Pharmaceu	tical Yes In Process	counsel's new Masters signatory.
		As per the template filed 4/25/2018 (ECF 279-1), Plaintiff served counsel Jack Smith on behalf of
		Masters Pharmaceutical with the City of Smithers, WV complaint and a waiver form on 7/12/2018
Masters		at 9:42 AM. Confirmation of original service and waiver sent with curative waiver to Defense
City of Smithers, WV 1:18-op-45319 Motley Rice Yes Pharmaceu	tical Yes In Process	
City of Simulators, vvv 1.10-0p-45315 Priority rice 11es Priority rice	iii Fiocess	Coursers new infasters signatory.
Associated		
Pharmacies		Waiver of the Service of Summons for the Town of Rupert, WV was signed and returned by counsel
Inc/America	an	David R. Beasley on behalf of Associated Pharmacies, Inc. on 7/3/2019 and filed 10/20/2020 as ECF
Town of Rupert, WV 1:18-op-45323 Motley Rice Yes Associated	Pharmacies Yes Yes	7/3/2019 22 on the case docket.
Associated		Curative service and waiver sent to Defense counsel, who stated willingness to accept service on
		Curative service and waiver sent to Defense counsel, who stated willingness to accept service on client's behalf. However, "in light of the Court's January 3, 2023 Order and the filings related to
Pharmacies		client's behalf. However, "in light of the Court's January 3, 2023 Order and the filings related to
Pharmacies Inc/America		

	Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
			-, -,					
	Simmons Hanly Conroy							
4.40			4 /2 /2022		i.i.			
1:18-op-45325	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
	Simmons Hanly Conroy.			Amneal				
		No	1/3/2023		Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
1.10 Op 13323	LLC	110	1/3/2023	Tharmaceaticals, me.	163			Site Not Faisang
	Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
		No	1/3/2023	IM Smith	No			
2.20 op 10025			2,0,2020	3111 01111011				
1.10 on 45330	Nanali Chlealaile	Ves		Llikee	Voc	Vac	2/14/2022	
1:18-0p-45330	ічарон эпконік	res		ПКШа	res	res	2/14/2023	
1:18-op-45330	- '	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
	Levin Papantonio							
1:18-op-45331	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
	Levin Papantonio							
1:18-op-45331		Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
	'							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
1·18-on-45334		No	12/14/2022	IM Smith	Ves	Ves		Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		110	12/14/2022	Jivi Jilliuli	103	103	7, 23, 2013	in tall filed the waiver with the court on 2/3/23.
		No	12/14/2022	Liliano	No			
		INU	12/14/2022	пікша	INU			
		No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
1:18-op-45334	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
	Levin Papantonio							
1:18-op-45335	Rafferty	Yes		Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
•				<u> </u>				
1:18-on-45336	· ·	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/24/2020	
1.10 OF 40000		103		KVK TCCII	103	103	11/27/2020	
1:18-op-45337	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
	1:18-op-45325 1:18-op-45325 1:18-op-45325 1:18-op-45330 1:18-op-45330 1:18-op-45331 1:18-op-45334 1:18-op-45334 1:18-op-45334 1:18-op-45334 1:18-op-45335 1:18-op-45335	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC No	1:18-op-45325 LLC No 1/3/2023 Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC No 1/3/2023 1:18-op-45325 LLC No 1/3/2023 1:18-op-45325 LLC No 1/3/2023 1:18-op-45325 LLC No 1/3/2023 1:18-op-45330 Napoli Shkolnik Yes 1:18-op-45330 Napoli Shkolnik Yes 1:18-op-45331 Rafferty Yes Levin Papantonio 1:18-op-45331 Rafferty Yes Levin Papantonio 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Blasingame, Burch, 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Blasingame, Burch, 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Blasingame, Burch, 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Blasingame, Burch, 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Blasingame, Burch, 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Blasingame, Burch, 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Levin Papantonio 1:18-op-45335 Rafferty Yes Levin Papantonio 1:18-op-45336 Rafferty Yes Levin Papantonio	1:18-op-45325 LLC	1:18-op-45325 LLC No 1/3/2023 Hikma No 1:18-op-45325 LLC No 1/3/2023 Mylan No 1:18-op-45330 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Hikma Yes 1:18-op-45330 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Mylan Yes 1:18-op-45330 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Mylan Yes 1:18-op-45331 Rafferty Yes JM Smith Yes 1:18-op-45331 Rafferty Yes JM Smith Yes 1:18-op-45331 Rafferty Yes Winn-Dixle Yes 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Hikma No 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No 1:18-op-45334 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No 1:18-op-45335 Rafferty Yes Burlington Drug Yes Levin Papantonio Levin Papa	1:18-op-45325	1:18-op-45325 LC

									Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548).
									Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, PGc, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847)
									• ②n April 14, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.
									•On June 3, 2019, another email was forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
									•On June 9, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:18-op-45338 Doc Nos. 129 and 130).
County of Oneida, New York v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45338	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		●On February 10, 2023, an email was re-forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service,
					Masters				Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Gratiot, MI	1:18-op-45339	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
Gratiot County, Michigan	1:18-op-45339	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		No			
Alcona County, Michigan	1:18-op-45340	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

renac County, Michigan 1:18-op-45341 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No 12/1/2022 My		1			1	1	•	1		
can affiliate of a solid, the center that the person across identified the mismarkous as a representative of Matters Parentacidical Thin, 16. At 5.0 - 40(31)) satisfied and WAL's control of Matters Parentacidical Thin, 16. At 5.0 - 40(31)) satisfied and WAL's control of Matters Parentacidical Wall shall make up in the major than the second of the sec										
abomt good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018. White & Luxemberg sought Masters was process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters of deep the circle of summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters of deep the raining study in close the Naters of sough on close the waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the efficient closery indicating that it representative accepted service each clearly indicating Masters' intent to prejudice plainoffs. Wett & Luxemberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No										each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the
forced W&L to serve summons on Mosters via process serve. This refused to walver request that it was named by W&L scients, and Masters' deby in raising the objection despite the efficient clearly indicate masters' managed by W&L scients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the efficient clearly indicate that the prejudice plaintiffs. 138-op-45340 Weltz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No 12/1/20										
Masters Weltz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical Yes Yes 5/21/2019 plaintiffs. Weltz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical Yes Yes 5/21/2019 plaintiffs. Weltz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical Yes Yes 5/21/2019 plaintiffs. I 18-op-45341 Weltz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No 12/1/										
uounty of Alcona, MI 138 op 45340 Weltz & Luxemberg No 12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical Yes Yes 5/21/2019 plaintiffs. 118 op 45341 Weltz & Luxemberg No 12/1/2022 Mylun No 1										'
ounty of Alcona, MI 118-op-45340 Welt & Livenberg No 12/1/2002 Pharmaceutical Yes Yes 5/21/2019 plaintiffs. In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Matters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(1)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Matters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(1)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients service upon Matters is pressumed valid. What's more, in the math three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that was since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation will wasters delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "To ca court to acquisite clients service was improper. In the unlikely event than Wasters failed, matters delay in raising this issue more than available that the unlikely event (under horizon) and the proper service of summons or an entry of appearance, job event W&L's clients had not properly secured severe of process upon Masters, passparance, so event W&L's clients had not properly secured severe of process upon Masters, but provided was to service address undersoned to service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weltz & Livenberg sought Masters' delay in raising the objection despite hay make service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weltz & Livenberg sought Masters' delay in raising the objection despite hay make service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weltz & Livenberg sought Masters' delay in raising the objection despite hay make service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weltz & Livenberg of servi						Masters				
in 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has falled until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under both loaw, "for a couprie jurisdiction fere must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance]." Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 38 N. E. 43 373, 391 (Or. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting funion Time, vo. Snader, 333 N. E. 26 606, 510 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisplued that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly severated service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withled waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(Q) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, % 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service alsoned cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018. Weta Ł uscenber sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters study masters waiver of service of summons masters via process server. This refusal waive service, Masters' delay in in saling the objection despite having actual these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal waive service, Masters' delay in calcing the objection despite having actual to waive service, Masters' delay in calcing that tis tergeted service and heavest despite a sing actual that was named by W&L's clients, a	County of Alcona, MI	1:18-op-45340	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters is practice upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation than twick's client's service was improper. In the untilikely event that Siz client's service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance ," Progressive Direct ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3 d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting lincoin Tavern, inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2 d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that sheets has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed so serve make the serve of service and present to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, %) (c)) obligate definedants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period throughout 2018, Weltz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service more somework of service and forced W&L to serve in more somework. Well to serve waiter of service waiter of service and forced W&L to serve. This refidition to vaive service, Masters' waiver of service and most of service and forced W&L to serve. This refidition to vaive service, Masters' dielay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and the correct and service and required the actual rotice waiver in the projudice in the projudice.	Arenac County, Michigan	1:18-op-45341	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
						Masters				each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
Source of the control	County of Arenac, MI	1:18-op-45341	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.

	1					_	1	_	
County of Dickinson, MI	1:18-op-45342	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	M 12/1/2022 Pł	lasters narmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Dickinson, Michigan	1:18-op-45342	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 M	lylan	No			
Country of losse MI	4.40 ap 45343	Weign & Lucyarks and	Ma		lasters	Vec	Vec	F (11/2010	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of losco, MI	1:18-op-45343	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Ph		Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
losco County, Michigan	1:18-op-45343	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 M	lylan	No			

	T					_	1	
City of Iron Mountain, MI	1:18-op-45344	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Masters 12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
Iron Mountain County,								
Michigan	1:18-op-45344	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Mylan	No			
County of Otsego, MI	1:18-op-45345	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Masters 12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
	·					162	3/21/2019	pidiffults.
Otsego County, Michigan	1:18-op-45345	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Mylan	No			

				In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only
County of Montmorency, MI 1:18-op-45347 Weitz & Luxenberg No	Masters 12/1/2022 Pharmaceu	ıtical Yes	Yes 5/21/20	because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
Montmorency County,	12, 1, 2022 Harmacea	ition i res	3,21,20	promiss.
Michigan 1:18-op-45347 Weitz & Luxenberg No	12/1/2022 Mylan	No		
	Masters			In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Ogemaw, MI 1:18-op-45348 Weitz & Luxenberg No	12/1/2022 Pharmaceu		Yes 5/21/20	019 plaintiffs.
Ogemaw County, Michigan 1:18-op-45348 Weitz & Luxenberg No	12/1/2022 Mylan	No		

such efficient of a receive formation. The process review is confident internative of Asserts in Process and Country of State and Washington of State							
each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(I)(I) is satisfied and M& dients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' del raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio lay, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there a proper service of mummons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. V. 186 N.E.3 37, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2 610 (Oh. 156)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfit they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is because Masters unreasonably withfield evalver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(I)(2) and Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waives absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg is Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters valve of service of summons. Masters valve of service advices service. This refusal to waive service of cell weight of the process server. This refusal to waive service of service of summons on Masters' via process server. This refusal to waive service of the process server. This refusal to waive service of service advices service advices despite the affidiant of the process service advices despite the affidiant of the proc	· · ·	· ·		 Pharmaceutical	Yes	5/21/2019	representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Shiawassee, MI 1:18-op-45350 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical Yes Yes 5/21/2019 indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to plaintiffs. Shiawassee County, Michigan 1:18-op-45350 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No				Pharmaceutical	Yes	5/21/2019	representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice

County of Lenawee, MI	1:18-op-45351	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
		·					Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
Lenawee County, Michigan	1:18-op-45351	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
County of Sanilac, MI	1:18-op-45352	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
Sanilac County, Michigan	1:18-op-45352	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		No		-,,	Processing and the second seco
Antrim County, Michigan	1:18-op-45354	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		No			
IAntrim (Olinty Milchigan									

	_	1	1	1		1	1	1	
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In
									each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a
									representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's
									clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half
									years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was
									improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in
									raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged
									deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be
									a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams,
									186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606,
									610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients
									had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if
									they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only
									because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the
									Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service
									absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought
									Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and
									forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service,
									Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was
									named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
					Masters				indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Antrim, MI	1:18-op-45354	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought
									Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and
									forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was
									named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
					Masters				indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Hillsdale, MI			l	1		1		1	
	11·1X-0n-45355	IWeitz & Liixenherg	INO	12/1/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	nlaintiffs
Hillsdale County, Michigan	1:18-op-45355 1:18-op-45355	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No No	12/1/2022 12/1/2022	Pharmaceutical Mylan	Yes No	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.

	1			1	T				
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the
									Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought
									Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service,
									Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
Benzie County, MI	1:18-op-45356	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
•	1:18-op-45356	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		No		-, ,	
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
					Masters				
County of Osceola, MI	1:18-op-45357	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.

Oceana County, Michigan 118-op-45359 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No 12/1/		_		1			1	1	
forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process serve. This reglact to wave service, Master of day 1,247,2002 Pharmaceutical Ves ves 5/21/2019 plantiffs. Vest & Lucenberg									each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought
County of Oceans, MI 218-op-45399 Weltz & Luxemberg No 121/1/20022 Myden No 121/1/2002 Myden No 121/1/20022 Myden No 121/1/20022 Myden No 121/1/200									
County of Oceans, MI 138 op 45359 Weit & Luxenberg No 124/1/2022 Mysin No 124/1/2022 Mysin No 124/1/2022 Mysin No 124/1/2022 Mysin No 125/1/2022 Mysin No 126/1/2022 Mysin No 127/1/2022 Mysi									·
Country of Coeana, MI 118-op-43399 Weltz & Luxenberg No 127/12022 Pharmaceutcal Ves Ves S721/2019 plantiffs. Oceana Country, Michigan 118-op-43399 Weltz & Luxenberg No 127/12022 Mylan No 118-op-43390 Weltz & Luxenberg No 127/12022 Mylan No No 127/12022 Mylan No No 127/12022 Mylan No No 127/12022 Mylan No									
Oceana County, Michigan 118-op-45359 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No 12/1/					Masters				
Alger County, Michigan 118-op-45560 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No 12/1/2022 M	County of Oceana, MI	1:18-op-45359	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
in 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person service in the milkely exervit that Twa. Fed. R. Cur. 94(1)(1) is satisfied and W&L's client's service is personnel value, What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has field cuttin tow to raise the allegation that W&L's client's service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's client's service was improper, in the unlikely event that W&L's client's service was improper, in service, in addition, under Clin low, for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance). Progressive Direct was a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance). The progressive Direct was a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance, over it W&L's clients had not properly executes upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied east in they had, in addition, the fact that W&L's client's service and a proper service was upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied east in they had, in addition, the fact that W&L's client's even was east to see in the was a proper service. In the properly executes upon Masters personal jurisdiction is satisfied and they are properly executes of summons or appearance, over was a properly and the Court's Case Management Order (DKL 232, pg. 10, 1 (6)) obligate defendants to waive service, above, good cause. Over a period of namy months throughout on the Court's Case Management Order (DKL 232, pg. 10, 1 (6)) obligate defendants to waive service above, above good cause. Over a period of namy months throughout on months throughout on the Court's Case Management Order (DKL 232, pg. 10, 1 (6)) obligate defendants to waive service, Masters' waive of service of summons. M	Oceana County, Michigan	1:18-op-45359	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Mylan	No			
each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients service upon Masters is presented valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed unlikely event that live WL's clients service was improper. In the unlikely event that live WL's clients service was improper. In the unlikely event that live WL's clients service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, unlount join law, "for a court to acquire the must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance," if Progressive Direct Ins. Co. williams, 18 N. E. 43 337, 33 (9) (h. Ct. App. 20) (h. Ct.	Alger County, Michigan	1:18-op-45360	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Mylan	No			
County of Alger, MI 1:18-op-45360 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical Yes Yes 5/21/2019 plaintiffs.									each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
	County of Alger MI	1·18-on-45360	Weitz & Luvenherg	No		Ves	Yes	5/21/2019	
	Baraga County, Michigan	1:18-op-45361	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical 12/1/2022 Mylan	No	162	2/21/2013	pianitins.

			,					T	
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was
				l	ļ				named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
					Masters				indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Baraga, MI	1:18-op-45361	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
County of Luce, MI	1:18-op-45362	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
	1:18-op-45362 1:18-op-45362		No No	12/1/2022		Yes No	res	2/21/2019	piainuns.
		Levin Papantonio		12, 1, 2322	,	<u> </u>		+	
		LCVIII I apantonio	!	¹	,	l i			

	1					T			
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only
									because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. $4(d)(2)$ and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, \P 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought
									Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was
									named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
County of Wexford, MI	1:18-op-45364	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
,									
County of Wexford, Michigan	1:18-op-45364	Weitz & Luxenberg	No Yes	12/1/2022	Mylan Mylan	No	Yes	2/12/2022	
Jefferson County, Ohio	1:18-op-45365	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Lake, MI Lake County, Michigan	1:18-op-45366 1:18-op-45366	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No No		Masters Pharmaceutical Mylan	Yes No	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
Lake County, Michigan	1:18-0p-45366	weitz & Luxenberg	NO	12/1/2022	iviyian	NO			
St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin County of Floyd, Kentucky The County of Knott, Kentucky	1:18-op-45367 1:18-op-45369 1:18-op-45370	Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik	Yes Yes		Dakota Drug Hikma Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	No Yes Yes	Yes	2/14/2023 3/9/2023	The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		Tapan omonim			SCALIGATO EEC			-, 5, 2020	
The County of Knoth Knoth	1.10 on 45270	Nanoli Chkolett	Vos		Amneal	Voc	Vos	2/0/2022	
The County of Knott, Kentucky County of Knot, Kentucky	1:18-op-45370 1:18-op-45370	Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik	Yes Yes	†	Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Hikma	Yes	Yes Yes	3/9/2023 3/24/2023	
County of Miot, Remucky	1.10 Ob-40010	Lianhou Sukouuk	163	<u> </u>	institu	1.03	103	3/24/2023	

			-					-	
		Levin Papantonio							
City of Panama City (FL)	1:18-op-45373	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
B	4.40 45272	Levin Papantonio			W	w	W	42/40/2020	
	1:18-op-45373 1:18-op-45374	Rafferty Napoli Shkolnik	Yes Yes		Winn-Dixie Hikma	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	12/18/2020 2/14/2023	
	1:18-op-45374	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
	1:18-op-45377-DAP	Wiggins Childs Pantazis F		3/27/2023	Michael Babich	Yes	No	2/13/2023	
	1.10 op 1.5077 5711	Blasingame, Burch,		2/21/2020					Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Banks County (GA)	1:18-op-45378	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 11/21/19.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Banks County, Georgia	1:18-op-45378	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Banks County, Georgia	1:18-op-45378	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Baraha Carreta Canada	4.40 45270	Blasingame, Burch,	N-	42/42/2022	NA de la ca	NI-			
Banks County, Georgia	1:18-op-45378	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/13/2022	Niyian	No			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Twiggs County (GA)	1:18-op-45379	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	IM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Twiggs county (GA)	1.16-0p-43373	Blasingame, Burch,	NO	12/14/2022	JIVI SIIIICII	163	163	4/23/2019	Frantin filed the waiver with the Court on 2/0/23.
Twiggs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45379	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
77		Blasingame, Burch,		. ,					
Twiggs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45379	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Twiggs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45379	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Elbert County (GA)	1:18-op-45381	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Elbert County, Georgia	1:18-op-45381	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amnoal	No			
Elbert County, Georgia	1:18-0p-45381	Blasingame, Burch,	INO	12/14/2022	Amneai	No			
Elbert County, Georgia	1:18-op-45381	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Elbert County) Cool Bid	1.10 op .5001	Blasingame, Burch,		12/11/2022		1.10			
Elbert County, Georgia	1:18-op-45381	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
City of Bainbridge, Georgia	1:18-op-45383	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
City of Bainbridge, Georgia	1:18-op-45383	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Deigh sides (CA)	4.40 - 45202	Blasingame, Burch,	N-	42/42/2022	IN A Consiste	V	V	4/25/2010	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
The City of Bainbridge (GA)	1:18-op-45383	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/13/2022	JIVI SMITH	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 4/1/20.
The City of Bainbridge, Georgia	1:18-on-45383	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
The city of buildings, deorgia	1.10 op 45505	Levin Papantonio	110	12/13/2022	7 timicai	110			
Martin County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:18-op-45388	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
		Levin Papantonio							
Wayne County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:18-op-45389	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/17/2020	
		Levin Papantonio			Auburn				Summons issued and awaiting affidavit from process server. Also, Case # listed is for Wayne
Wayne Cty. Fiscal Court, CA	1:18-op-45389	Rafferty	Yes		Pharmaceutical	Yes	No	00/00/00	County, KY and mistakenly named as Wayne County, CA.
(1) Family Practice Clinic of					Associated				
Booneville, Inc. and					Pharmacies				
(2) Family Health Care Clinic,					Inc/American				
	1:18-op-45390	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	6/10/2019	
	·	Levin Papantonio							
Carter County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:18-op-45392	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	12/7/2021	
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Bulloch County (GA)	1:18-op-45394	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/12/20.
Dullank Carris Const	4:40 45004	Blasingame, Burch,	NI-	40/10/05==	A	N =			
Bulloch County, Georgia	1:18-op-45394	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/13/2022	Amneai	No			
Bulloch County, Georgia	1:18-op-45394	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Dunion Country, Georgia	2.10 OP 73334	Blasingame, Burch,		12/13/2022					
Bulloch County, Georgia	1:18-op-45394	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
-11		Levin Papantonio		,, - 922	,				
Itawamba County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45396	Rafferty	Yes		Amneal	No			
Allen County Board of		Spangenberg Shibley &							As owner of the repository, we were the first to submit our clients PFSs. Due to a technical glitch,
Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45401	Liber	No	1/28/2023	Mylan	No			this PFS was not transferred into the new repository.
A4 . P		Levin Papantonio	,		n 4 6 - 31	W	W	0 100 105 -	
Madison County (TN)	1:18-op-45403	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	

The Uniffies Government of Macron Mark County, George 1 (16) of 14/27 (17) of 14/27 (1		_								
Part										each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a
International Content of Conten										years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged
Court Court Movement of No.										186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if
Authors 12 10 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15										Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service,
Cap of Earn Support, 6th 13 de, 94-840; 25 de										named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
Moon Bib County, (No. 18 op 45407 Carrage & Asiley, P.C. No. 12/14/2002 M. Seingare, Burch, No. No. 12/14/2002 M. Seingare, Burch, No. No. 12/14/2002 Milms No.	City of Grand Rapids, MI	1:18-op-45406	•	No	12/1/2022		Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
The Unified Government of Misconibio County, Ceorgia 128-op-65407 Garrard & Advisor, P.C. No. 1274/2002 Manual No.	The Unified Government of Macon Bibb County (GA)	1:18-op-45407		No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	
Macon-Bib County, Georgia 11-0-p-5107 Sarrar & Alleley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Name No							100		1, 20, 2020	
Miscon-Biblic County, Georgia 118-op-45407 Garrard & Ashrley, P. C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No	Macon-Bibb County, Georgia	1:18-op-45407		No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Miscon-Biblic County, Georgia 118-op-45407 Garrard & Ashrley, P. C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No		·								
Unified Government of Macon 18 Bisingsame, Burch 18 Bisingsame		1:18-op-45407		No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Bibb Courty, Georgia 138-op-45407 Garard & Ashley, P.C. No 1/14/2022 Mylan No Courty, Georgia 138-op-45409 Courty, Georgia Courty, Georgia Courty, Georgia 138-op-45409 Courty, Georgia Courty, Georgia 138-op-45409 Courty, Georgia Courty, Georg	7		,		, , ,					
Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceutical USA, Inc. not a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA inc. not a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent 3/2/023. Signed and returned 3/3/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/2/023. Hikma Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent 3/3/2023. Declaration of Service repressional service filed 3/2/023. Hikma Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent 3/3/2023. Declaration of Service repressional service filed 3/2/023. Hikma Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named defendant waiver request originally sent to West-Ward Pharmaceutical USA. Inc. not a named sen		1·18-on-45407		No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Thurston County, Washington 138-op-45409 Keller Rohrback LL.P. Ves Hilma Ves Ves 3/20/203 Personal service perfected 3/15/203.	bibb county, deorgia	1.16-0β-45407	Garrard & Asiliey, F.C.	140	12/14/2022	iviyiaii	NO			Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
Thurston County, Washington 1.18 op-45400 Keller Rohrback LL.P. Yes Hilma Yes Yes 3/30/2023 Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Washer (filed 3/20/23-After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/16/2023 Signed and retur										· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Clark County, WA 1:8-op-45410 Keller Rohrback LLP. Ves KVK-Tech Ves Ves 3/8/2023 Signed and returned 3/8/2023. Signed and returned 3/8/2023 Signed and returned 3/8/2023 Pediatrion of Service Pressonal service Pietro 4/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.	Thurston County, Washington	1:18-op-45409	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Clark County, Washington 1:18-op-45410 Keller Rohrback LL.P. Yes	Clark County, WA	1:18-op-45410	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	
Clark County, Washington 1.18-op-45410 Keller Rohrback LL.P. Yes Hikma Yes Yes 3/20/2023 Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.	ciaix county, iii	1120 OF 15 120	Neiler Neill Been Eleit	1.05		NVIX 10011			5, 5, 2525	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
Clark County, Washington 1:18-op-45410 Keller Rohrback LL.P. Yes Hikma Yes Yes 3/20/203 Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.										' '
Fentress County (TN) 1:18-op-45419 Rafferty Yes MS mith Yes Yes 3/22/201	Clark County, Washington	1:18-op-45410	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Levin Papantonio Rafferty Yes TopRx Yes Yes 4/7/2021 Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.	Fortunes Co. 11 (Tre)	1:10 15110	•	V		In a Constitu	V	V-		
Fentress County, TN 1:18-op-45419 Rafferty Yes TopRx Yes Yes 4/7/2021 Plaintiff flied the waiver on 4/25/19.	Fentress County (TN)	1:18-op-45419		Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/22/2021	
Dones Country, (GA) 1:18-op-45424 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 JM Smith Yes Yes 4/25/2019 Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.	Fentress County, TN	1:18-op-45419	Rafferty	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	4/7/2021	
Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Hikma No No No No No No No N	Jones County (GA)	1:18-on-45424	_	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	=
Blasingame, Burch, Jones County, Georgia 1:18-op-45424 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No 12/14/2022 Mylan No 12/14/2022 Mylan No Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23. Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23. Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Hikma No Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No No 12/14/2022 Mylan No Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.			Blasingame, Burch,						., 23, 2323	
Jones County, Georgia 1:18-op-45424 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No	Jones County, Georgia	1:18-op-45424		No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Jones County, Georgia 1:18-op-45424 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Amneal No Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Warren County (GA) 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 JM Smith Yes Yes 4/25/2019 Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23. Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Hikma No Signer Blasingame, Burch, Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No Signer Blasingame, Burch,	Jones County, Georgia	1:18-op-45424		No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Blasingame, Burch, Warren County (GA) 1:18-op-45425 Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 JM Smith Yes Yes 4/25/2019 Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23. Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Hikma No Blasingame, Burch, Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No Blasingame, Burch, Blasing	Janes County Coordin	1.10 45424	_	Ne	12/14/2022	Ammool	No			
Warren County (GA) 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch, Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Hikma No Blasingame, Burch, Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch, Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No Hikma No Hikma No Blasingame, Burch, Blasingame,	Jones County, Georgia	1:18-0p-45424		INU	12/14/2022	Amneai	INO			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Hikma No No Blasingame, Burch, Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No Blasingame, Burch, Blasingame, Burch, Blasingame, Burch, Blasingame, Burch,	Warren County (GA)	1:18-op-45425	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	
Blasingame, Burch, Warren County, Georgia 1:18-op-45425 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 12/14/2022 Mylan No Blasingame, Burch,	Warren County, Georgia	1:18-on-45425		No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Blasingame, Burch,	Trairen county, deorgia	2.20 Op 75425	Blasingame, Burch,		12, 17, 2022	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	Warren County, Georgia	1:18-op-45425		No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
	Warren County, Georgia	1:18-op-45425	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			

	T		1	Т	_			
	1:18-op-45427	Kelley & Ferraro No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of North Royalton, OH	1:18-op-45427	Kelley & Ferraro No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
		Lockridge Grindal Nauen		Amneal				
Douglas County, Minnesota	1:18-op-45428	P.L.L.P. Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/25/2019	
	1:18-op-45431	Kelley & Ferraro No	2/17/2023		Yes	In Process	0, 0, 0, 0	
City of Huron, OH	·		2/17/2023		Yes	In Process		
	1:18-op-45431	Kelley & Ferraro No	2/17/2023	Indivior	res	In Process		
City of Warren v. Purdue								
Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45434	Napoli Shkolnik No	12/22/2022	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Warren, Ohio	1:18-op-45434	Napoli Shkolnik No	12/22/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Northern Arapaho Tribe	1:18-op-45438			Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	s Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Northern Arapaho Tribe, WY v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45438			SuperValu	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Counties of Clackamas, Lane, Washington, Clatsop, Columbia, Jackson, Josephine, and Yamhill, OR	1:18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C. No	11/29/2022 & 2/7/2023 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22 but resent on 2/7/23 after not being place in repository in 11/22		No			
County of Clackamas et al.,	440 45442	Diamenta laur Graver B. G. Na	11/29/2022 & 2/7/2023 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22 but resent on 2/7/23 after not being place					
Oregon	1:18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C. No	in repository in 11/22	Hikma	No			
			11/29/2022 - sent to					
			PFS counsel on					
County of Clackamas, OR	1:18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C. No	11/21/22	KVK-Tech	No			
			11/29/2022 - sent to PFS counsel on					
	1:18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C. No	11/21/22	Mylan	No			
Pocahontas County								
Commission, West Virginia	1:18-op-45443	Skinner Law Firm		Hikma	No			This Defendant is not named in the Complaint
Pocahontas County				Masters				
Commission, WV	1:18-op-45443	Skinner Law Flrm		Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed 03/22/2023
Pocahontas County								
Commission, WV	1:18-op-45443	Skinner Law Flrm		Indivior	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
Commission, vv v	1.10-0h-40449	Skinilet Law Hilli		inuivioi	140			Diamination OZ/ZO/ZOZa
	1:18-OP-45444	Skinner Law Firm		TopRx	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
Morgan County Commission,								
	1:18-op-45444	Skinner Law Firm		Hikma	No			This Defendant is not named in the Complaint
Morgan County Commission, WV	1:18-op-45444	Skinner Law Firm		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed 03/22/2023
Morgan County Commission,	1:18-op-45444	Skinner Law Firm		Indivior				Dismissed 02/28/2023
			2/47/202		No	In Dun a control	_	DISHIISSEU UZ/ZO/ZUZS
	1:18-op-45447	Kelley & Ferraro No	2/17/2023		Yes	In Process		
	1:18-op-45447	Kelley & Ferraro No	2/17/2023		Yes	In Process		
	1:18-op-45448	Kelley & Ferraro No	2/17/2023	3 Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Village of Newburgh Heights,								
	1:18-op-45449	kelley & ferraro No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Village of Newburgh Heights,		,	2, 2, , 2020	† ' ·	1			
ОН	1:18-op-45449	kelley & ferraro No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Village of Brooklyn Heights,				J	I			
Ohio	1:18-op-45450	kelley & ferraro No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Village of Brooklyn Heights, OH	1:18-op-45450	kelley & ferraro No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
		•				•		

		Levin Papantonio							
Cherokee, KS	1:18-op-45452	Rafferty	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
		Blasingame, Burch,							
City of Tifton, Georgia	1:18-op-45454	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
The City of Tifton (GA)	1:18-op-45454	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
The City of Tifton, Georgia	1:18-op-45454	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Tifton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45454	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
	·	Levin Papantonio							
Bay County (FL)	1:18-op-45455	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/16/2020	
, , , ,		Levin Papantonio						, , , , , ,	
Bay County, FL	1:18-op-45455	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/16/2020	
	2.20 op 10 100	Levin Papantonio	1.65		TTIME SINCE		1.00	11/10/1020	
Holmes County (FL)	1:18-op-45456	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/29/2020	
riolines county (1 L)	1.10 Op 43430	Blasingame, Burch,	103		JIVI SITIICII	103	103	12/23/2020	
City of Gainesville, Georgia	1:18-op-45486	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hilma	No			
City of Gamesville, Georgia	1.10-0µ-45460		INO	12/14/2022	Пікіна	INU			
City of Coincertille, Const.	1.10 on 45 400	Blasingame, Burch,	No	42/44/2022	Mulan	l _{No}			
City of Gainesville, Georgia	1:18-op-45486	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	iviyldfi	No			Defendent stoned and netroned the control of the Co
The City of Colors III (Col	1.10 45.400	Blasingame, Burch,	NI -	40/11/02	INA Consists		V	4/25/2040	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
The City of Gainesville (GA)	1:18-op-45486	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JIVI SMITH	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
The City of Gainesville, Georgia	1:18-op-45486	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
		Levin Papantonio							
City of Malden (MA)	1:18-op-45487	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/8/2020	
		Levin Papantonio							
Wyoming County, Pennsylvania	1:18-op-45488	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/21/2020	
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Butts County, Georgia	1:18-op-45490	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Butts County, Georgia	1:18-op-45490	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Butts County, Georgia	1:18-op-45490	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
,,		Blasingame, Burch,		, -, -					Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Dougherty County (GA)	1:18-op-45491	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	IM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
beagnerty equity (e.t.)	1.10 Op 43431	Blasingame, Burch,		12, 21, 2022	3111 31111111		1.00	1/23/2013	Transmitted the Walter With the Court on 2/0/201
Dougherty County, Georgia	1:18-op-45491	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
bougherty county, deorgia	1.10-0p-45451	Blasingame, Burch,	NO	12/14/2022	TIIKITIG	NO			
Dougherty County, Georgia	1:18-op-45491	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Dougherty County, Georgia	1.16-0p-45491	Blasingame, Burch,	INO	12/14/2022	iviyidii	INO			
Davida de Carreta Carreta	1.10 45401	_	NI -	12/14/2022	A	N -			
Dougherty County, Georgia	1:18-op-45491	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneai	No			
St. Tammany Parish Coroner's									
Office and Dr. Charles Preston									
in his capacity as the Coroner		Lillis Law Firm & Tonry,							Indivior, through its registered agent in LA, was served with the waiver and notice of lawsuit on
of St. Tammany Parish, LA	1:18-op-45492	Brinson, & Glorioso	No	3/20/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		May 28, 2019 by certified US Mail. See Green Card attached.
(1) Big Bend Community Based									
Care Inc.;									
(2) Lutheran Services Floria									
Inc.;									
(3) Central Florida Cares									
Health System Inc.;									
(4) Southeast Florida									
Behavioral Health Network					Associated				
Inc.; and					Pharmacies				
(5) Central Florida Behavioral					Inc/American				This Plaintiff is not a governmental plaintiff but a private corporation that contracts with the State
` '	1:18-op-45493	Price Armstrong, LLC	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	No		of Florida
Big Bend Community Based	1.10-0p-43433	i nec Amistrong, LLC	140	17/5	, 1330 Clateu Filai III acies	103	140		This Plaintiff is not a governmental plaintiff but a private corporation that contracts with the State
	1:19 on 45402	Price Armstrong IIC	No	N/A	Hikma	Vos	No		of Florida
	1:18-op-45493	Price Armstrong, LLC	No	IN/A	HINIIIa	Yes	No		This Plaintiff is not a governmental plaintiff but a private corporation that contracts with the State
Big Bend Community Based	1.10 45400	Drice Armetics - 110	No	N / A	Winn Divis	Vas	No		
Case, Inc.	1:18-op-45493	Price Armstrong, LLC	No	N/A	Winn-Dixie	Yes	No		of Florida
	1:18-op-45495	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022		No			
City of Gainesville, Georgia					IN AN ALDER	INO		i	

		Blasingame, Burch,							
City of Milledgeville, Georgia	1:18-op-45495	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
	1:18-op-45495	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
The City of Milledgeville,		Blasingame, Burch,							
Georgia	1:18-op-45495	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Vanderbugh County, Indiana	1:18-op-45498	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
									A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018.
									Defendant did not allege a service defect. However, upon review, Plaintiff discovered that this
									Defendant had not been served. We perfected service via process server on 2/28/2023 and and
Vanderburgh County (IN)	1:18-op-45498	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023	filed proof of service in the individual case.
Vanderburgh County, Indiana	1:18-op-45498	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
St. Joseph County, IN	1:18-op-45500	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
St. Joseph County, Indiana	1:18-op-45500	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
St. Joseph County, Indiana	1:18-op-45500	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
	1:18-op-45500	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
	1:18-op-45500	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Prince George's County					American Sales				
,	1:18-op-45501	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Company, LLC	Yes	Yes	3/21/2023	
Prince George's County,				•					
- '	1:18-op-45501	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Prince George's County,									
	1:18-op-45501	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
·					Ahold Delhaize USA,			, -, -	
Prince George's County, MD	1:18-op-45501	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/23/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
	1:18-op-45503	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
, , , ,	1:18-op-45503	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
- chem county, coolgin	1.10 op .5505	Blasingame, Burch,			,	1.00	1.00	2/ 23/ 2023	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Jasper County (GA)	1:18-op-45504	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
casper seaming (enty	1.12 ор .550 .	Blasingame, Burch,				1.00	1.00	., 23, 2023	
Jasper County, Georgia	1:18-op-45504	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Juspel Scalley, Scolgia	1.10 op 45504	Blasingame, Burch,	1.10	12/11/2022		1.10			
Jasper County, Georgia	1:18-op-45504	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Jusper County, Georgia	1.10 OF 45504	Blasingame, Burch,	110	12/11/2022	iviyidii	140			
Jasper County, Georgia	1:18-op-45504	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Jusper County, Georgia	1.10 OP +330+	Blasingame, Burch,	140	12/14/2022	Annear	140			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Ben Hill County (GA)	1:18-op-45505	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	IM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 11/22/19.
Berrini County (GA)	1.10-0p-45505	Blasingame, Burch,	IVO	12/13/2022	. JIVI JIIIICII	163	163	4/23/2013	Plantin filed the waiver with the court on 11/22/13.
Ben Hill County, Georgia	1:18-op-45505	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	likma	No			
Berrini County, Georgia	1.10-0p-45505	Blasingame, Burch,	IVO	12/13/2022	TIKITIG	140			
Ben Hill County, Georgia	1:18-op-45505	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Bell Hill County, Georgia	1.16-0p-45505	Blasingame, Burch,	INO	12/13/2022	iviyidii	INO			
Ben Hill County, Georgia	1:18-op-45505	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amnoal	No			
		Bryant Law Center	Yes	12/13/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
County of Wilcox, Georgia	1:18-op-45506	bryant Law Center	res		Amneal	162	III Process		
The County of Wilcox, Georgia	1:19 on 45500	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Amneai Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
	1:18-op-45506 1:18-op-45506	Bryant Law Center Bryant Law Center	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
County of Wilcox, GA	1.16-0p-45506	Mike Moore Law Firm,	res		IIIuivioi	162	III Process		
Hamilton County (TNI)	1.10 45507		N-	44 /40 /2022	INA Constale	V	NI-		
Hamilton County (TN)	1:18-op-45507	LLC Blacingama Burah	No	11/18/2022	JIVI SMILN	Yes	No		Defendant signed and veturned the universal A/25/40
Lina a la Cassata (CA)	1.10 45500	Blasingame, Burch,	N-	1/1/2022	INA Constale	V	V	4/25/2040	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Lincoln County (GA)	1:18-op-45508	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	1/4/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Linaala Caumtu Caamia	1.10 45500	Blasingame, Burch,	N-	1/1/2022	1181	NI-			
Lincoln County, Georgia	1:18-op-45508	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	1/4/2023	ПКШd	No		+	
Lincoln County County	1.10 on 45500	Blasingame, Burch,	No	4/4/2022	Amanaal	l _{No}			
Lincoln County, Georgia	1:18-op-45508	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	1/4/2023	Allinedi	No			Defendant stand and astronomy the survivors on A/OF/40
MaDuffia County (CA)	1.10 on 45500	Blasingame, Burch,	No	42/44/2022	INA Consists	Vos	Ves	4/25/2010	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
McDuffie County (GA)	1:18-op-45509	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JIVI SMITN	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
M-Duffi- Co	4.40 45500	Blasingame, Burch,	N -	401.105	11:1:	 N =			
McDuffie County, Georgia	1:18-op-45509	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	нікта	No			
M.D. (5)	4.40	Blasingame, Burch,		401-1	J	1 .			
McDuffie County, Georgia	1:18-op-45509	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	ıviylan	No			
wieburne county, deorgia		- ·							
7. 0	1:18-op-45509	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022		No			

City of Phoenix, Arizona	1:18-op-45510	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity — Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. — with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 33. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
City of Keene, New Hampshire		Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
The City of Keene, NH	1:18-op-45511	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			
City of Hothicalous (NAC)	1.10 45512	Levin Papantonio	V		JM Smith	V	V	7/22/2019	
City of Hattiesburg (MS)	1:18-op-45512	Rafferty Levin Papantonio	Yes		JIVI SITIILII	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
Hattiesburg, MS	1:18-op-45512	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
Tideticsburg, IVIS	1.10 OP +3312	Levin Papantonio	Tes		WIIII DIXIC	163	163	7/22/2013	
City of Lowell (MA)	1:18-op-45514	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/7/2020	
, , ,		Friedman, Dazzio &							
City of Sandy Springs, Georgia	1:18-op-45516	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		
		Friedman, Dazzio &							
City of Sandy Springs, Georgia	1:18-op-45516	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
		Friedman, Dazzio &							
City of Sandy Springs, GA	1:18-op-45516	Zulanas, P.C. Friedman, Dazzio &	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
City of Clarksville, Tennessee	1:18-op-45517	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		
city of clarksville, refillessee	1.10 Op 43317	Friedman, Dazzio &	103		TIKITO	163	1111100033		
City of Clarksville, Tennessee	1:18-op-45517	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
The City of Clarksville,	·	Friedman, Dazzio &			Amneal				
Tennessee	1:18-op-45517	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
		Friedman, Dazzio &							
City of Clarksville, TN	1:18-op-45517	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Spirit Lake Tribe	1:18-op-45520				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians	1:18-op-45521				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Chippewa mulans	1.16-υμ-43321	Levin Papantonio			Dakota Di ug	No			Entities only and did not apply to plantin-tribes (see 0/20/18 Order, #042).
McDowell County (NC)	1:18-op-45524	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
The Fiscal Court of Bourbon		,							
County (KY)	1:18-op-45533	The Finnell Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
		Blasingame, Burch,		_					Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Hancock County (GA)	1:18-op-45535	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
	4.40 45505	Blasingame, Burch,		40/11/05					
Hancock County, Georgia	1:18-op-45535	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	нікта	No			
Hancock County, Georgia	1:18-op-45535	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Transcock County, Georgia	1.10 OP 73333	Blasingame, Burch,		12/14/2022		1.0			
Hancock County, Georgia	1:18-op-45535	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
,, ,	•	Levin Papantonio		• •					
, , , ,	1:18-op-45537	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	8/28/2019	
Arizona School Alliance for									Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
Workers Compensation	1:18-op-45540	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023.
					Associated Pharmacies				
The Arizona School Alliance for					Inc/American				
	1:18-op-45540	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
	1 ob 19940		1				1	_, _, _, _025	

	1		T	T	1	T	T	1	
	1:18-op-45541	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Johnson, Johnson, Lucas & Middleton		N/A	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes		N/A	Plaintiff is a Tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
City of Wilkes Barre,									
Pennsylvania v. Purdue		Levin Papantonio							
Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45545	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	3/25/2021	
City of Dunbar, WV	1:18-op-45546	Motley Rice	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		As per the template filed 4/25/2018 (ECF 279-1), Plaintiff served counsel Jack Smith on behalf of Masters Pharmaceutical with the City of Dunbar, WV complaint and a waiver form on 7/11/2018 at 10:06 AM. Confirmation of original service and waiver sent with curative waiver to Defense counsel's new Masters signatory.
Harrison County Board of									
Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45547	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
		Levin Papantonio	.,		5		.,		
Miami-Dade County, FL	1:18-op-45552	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
Baltimore County, Maryland	1:18-op-45554	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 12, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 12, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 21. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 12, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have now been effectively cured.
		Levin Papantonio							
Town of Brewster, MA	1:18-op-45556	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
		Levin Papantonio			American Sales			- / /	
Town of Brewster, MA	1:18-op-45556	Rafferty	Yes		Company, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	
Ponca Tribe of Nebraska	1:18-op-45557				Dakota Drug	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Jefferson County, Alabama; Mike Hale, Sheriff of Jefferson County, Alabama; City of Pleasant Grove, Alabama; City of Hueytown, Alabama; City of Mountain Brook, Alabama; Jefferson County Board of		Riley & Jackson, P.C.							
	1:18-op-45558	Napoli Shkolnik, PLLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
(1) Jefferson County, AL; (2) Mike Hale as Sheriff of Jeff. Co., AL; (3) City of Pleasantgrove, AL; (4) City of Hueytown, AL; (5) City of Mountain Brook, AL; and (6) Jeff. Co. Bd. of Health		Riley & Jackson, P.C. Napoli Shkolnik, PLLC	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies		Yes	2/24/2023	The case was originally filed in state court. Service on this defendant by the Clerk via certified mail was requested at the office of its registered agent that was on file with the Alabama Secretary of State. We now know this defendant had not discharged its obligation of updating its registered agent information. While service was being attempted on the wrong registered agent at the wrong address, the case was removed from the Circuit Court of Jefferson County to the USDC for the Northern District of Alabama. The case was then quickly transferred into the MDL with a Motion to Remand pending. We did not realize service on Associated Pharmacies after transfer to the MDL had not been perfected and did not request this defendant to execute a waiver of service. This defendant's counsel has agreed to accept service without signing a waiver. Process has been provided to this defendant's counsel.
(o) Jen. Co. Bu. Of Health	1.10-0h-43330	Blasingame, Burch,	163		Associated Filalifiacles	163	162	2/24/2023	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Habersham County (GA)	1:18-op-45559	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,	-	,, -022			7.55	., 25, 2525	
Habersham County, Georgia	1:18-op-45559	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
,,		Blasingame, Burch,		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
Habersham County, Georgia	1:18-op-45559	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Habersham County, Georgia	1:18-op-45559	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
		Levin Papantonio			Ahold Delhaize USA,				
Town of Brewster, MA	1:18-op-4556	Rafferty	Yes		Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Case number listed incorrectly. It should be 1:18-op-45556.

	1	I	_		1			
Taura of Dillouine AAA	4.40 45560	Levin Papantonio	V	10 W TI-	V	V	11/22/2020	
Town of Billerica, MA	1:18-op-45560	Rafferty Blasingame, Burch,	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	Defendant signed and veture of the universe of 4/25/40
Taliafanna Cauntus (CA)	4.40 45563		N	42/44/2022 INA Contib	V	V	4/25/2010	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Taliaferro County (GA)	1:18-op-45562	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Taliafanna Carretto Casusia	1.10 45562		NI -	42/44/2022 Uillima	NI -			
Taliaferro County, Georgia	1:18-op-45562	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
Tallia farma Carata Carata	4.40 45563	Blasingame, Burch,		42/44/2022 44 1				
Taliaferro County, Georgia	1:18-op-45562	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Taliaferro County, Georgia	1:18-op-45562	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Washington County (GA)	1:18-op-45563	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Washington County, Georgia	1:18-op-45563	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/30/19.
Washington County, Georgia	1:18-op-45563	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	Yes	Yes	5/30/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/7/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Washington County, Georgia	1:18-op-45563	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		Levin Papantonio						
Columbus (GA)	1:18-op-45567	Rafferty	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
		Levin Papantonio						
Columbus, GA	1:18-op-45567	Rafferty	Yes	Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	3/15/2021	
		Levin Papantonio						
County of Overton, TN	1:18-op-45568	Rafferty	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
								Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, they served the domestic entity — Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. — with the short form and operative complaint. <i>See</i> Dkt. No. 32. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiffs
City of Concord, New Hampshire; City of Dover, New		Robbins Geller Rudman						also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural
Hampshire	1:18-op-45573	& Dowd LLP	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
		Blasingame, Burch,	1.00			1.22		Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Tattnall County (GA)	1:18-op-45574	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
ratinal Sounty (Sr.)	2.20 op .007 .	Blasingame, Burch,		12/11/2022 311 3111 111		. 65	., 23, 2023	Trained the nation with the sources 2/5/25
Tattnall County, Georgia	1:18-op-45574	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
rattrian county, deorgia	1.10 ор 43374	Blasingame, Burch,	110	12/14/2022 111/1114	110			
Tattnall County, Georgia	1:18-op-45574	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
rattrian county, deorgia	1.10-0p-45574	Blasingame, Burch,	INO	12/14/2022 INIVIAN	INO			
Tattnall County, Georgia	1:19 on 45574	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
City of Woodbury, Georgia	1:18-op-45574 1:18-op-45575	•	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Ves	3/24/2023	
	1:18-op-45575	Bryant Law Center		Mylan		Yes	3/27/2023	
City of Woodbury, Georgia	1:18-0p-45575	Bryant Law Center Blasingame, Burch,	Yes	lviyiari	Yes	Yes	3/2//2023	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/35/40
T	4.40			42/44/2022 144.5 - 111			4/25/2040	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Toombs County (GA)	1:18-op-45576	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Tanaha Causto Causto	4.40 45536	Blasingame, Burch,	l _{N1}	42/44/2022	N-			
Toombs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45576	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
T	4.40	Blasingame, Burch,	.	42/11/2020	ļ			
Toombs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45576	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
	1	Blasingame, Burch,			L			
Toombs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45576	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
County of Macon, Georgia	1:18-op-45577	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Macon County, Georgia	1:18-op-45577	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
				Amneal				
The County of Macon, Georgia	· ·	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
Macon County, GA	1:18-op-45577	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
		Blasingame, Burch,			1			
Newton County (GA)	1:18-op-45578	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Newton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45578	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
. <u> </u>		Blasingame, Burch,						
Newton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45578	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
,,		Blasingame, Burch,			1			
Newton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45578	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
County of Peach, Georgia	1:18-op-45579	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	p :==:=	,		1 / -	1	<u> </u>	(-, ,	

					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
					Inc/American				
Peach County, GA	1:18-op-45579	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	
					Amneal				
	1:18-op-45579	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
-	1:18-op-45579	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
	1:18-op-45580	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Schley County, Georgia	1:18-op-45580	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/24/2023	
					Amneal				
The County of Schley, Georgia	1:18-op-45580	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/24/2023	
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Jackson County (GA)	1:18-op-45581	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Jackson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45581	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Jackson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45581	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Jackson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45581	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
City of Huntington Day		Skikos Crawford Skikos							A request for universal complex purposes to EDCD Dula 4/4) and CNO 4
City of Huntington Beach,		& Joseph				l.,			A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on
California	1:18-op-45588	Robinson Calcagnie	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
									The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and
T I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I									fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In
Tulalip Tribes, WA v. Purdue					6	l			addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45589				SuperValu	No			Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
									Distriction - Table and one in secretable listed by Defendant on Defendant - and feet short
									Plaintiff is a Tribe and was incorrectly listed by Defendant on Defendant's service and fact sheet
									list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. Defendant
Tulalip Tribes, WA v. Purdue									does not contend that it was not served with process. In addition, as Defendant expressly acknowledges (see #4836 at 2), the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was
	1:18-op-45589	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.		N/A	SuperValu	No			applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
riidiiiid L.F., et di.	1.18-0p-45589	Keller Kolli back L.L.F.		IN/A	Supervalu	INO			Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
City of Kent, Washington	1:18-op-45590	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
city of Kent, washington	1.18-0p-45550	Levin Papantonio	163		TIIKIIIG	163	163	3/20/2023	r ersonal service perfected 3/13/2023.
City of Evansville (IN)	1:18-op-45591	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/9/2019	
	1:18-op-45592	Bryant Law Center	Yes			Yes	Yes	3/24/2023	
	1:18-op-45592	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process	3/21/2023	
_ ·	1:18-op-45593	Bryant Law Center	Yes		†	Yes	In Process		
The County of Ballard,	1.10 op 1.0000	Di yant zan Genter			Amneal	. 65			
*	1:18-op-45593	Bryant Law Center	Yes			Yes	In Process		
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA							
		Milberg Coleman Bryson							
City of Harrisburg, Illinois	1:18-op-45594	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		
	·								
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA							
		Milberg Coleman Bryson							
City of Harrisburg, Illinois	1:18-op-45594	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA							
		Milberg Coleman Bryson			Amneal				
City of Harrisburg, Illinois	1:18-op-45594	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
i i									l l
		Sanders Phillips							
		Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA							
		Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson	Yes						

	T	l			1	1			I
Town of Salisbury, MA	1:18-op-45595	Levin Papantonio	Voc		VVV Toch	Vos	Voc	11/19/2020	
TOWN OF Salisbury, IVIA	1:18-0p-45595	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/19/2020	
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA							
		Milberg Coleman Bryson							
City of Princeton, Illinois	1:18-op-45599	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA							
		Milberg Coleman Bryson							
City of Princeton, Illinois	1:18-op-45599	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA							
		Milberg Coleman Bryson			Amneal				
City of Princeton, Illinois	1:18-op-45599	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
,	1.10 op 15555					1.00			
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA							
		Milberg Coleman Bryson							
City of Princeton, IL	1:18-op-45599	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
									Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and
									Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan
									Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 38. CMO 1
									suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service,
									Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff
		Robbins Geller Rudman							also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has
City of Los Angeles, California	1:18-op-45601	& Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
City of Los Afigeles, California	1.16-0p-45001	Blasingame, Burch,	res		iviyiaii	Tes	les	2/17/2025	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Worth County (GA)	1:18-op-45602	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	IM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Worth county (GA)	1.10 Op 43002	Blasingame, Burch,	140	12/14/2022	JIVI SITIICII	103	163	4/25/2015	Trainent filed the waiver with the court on 2/0/23.
Worth County, Georgia	1:18-op-45602	=	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,	-	, , , -	-	-			
Worth County, Georgia	1:18-op-45602	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Worth County, Georgia	1:18-op-45602	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
City of Fitzgerald , Georgia	1:18-op-45603	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
City of Fitzgerald, Georgia	1:18-op-45603		No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
=1 0: (5:: 11/04)	4.40	Blasingame, Burch,		40/44/0000				. /05 /00.0	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
The City of Fitzgerald (GA)	1:18-op-45603	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
The City of Fitzgerald, Georgia	1:18-op-45603	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amnoal	No			
The City of Fitzgerald, Georgia	1.16-0p-45005	Levin Papantonio	INO	12/14/2022	Affilledi	No			
Forsyth County (NC)	1:18-op-45605	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
	20 Op5005	Blasingame, Burch,	5			1.20		3, 20, 2023	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Columbia County (GA)	1:18-op-45607	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23.
, , , , ,		Blasingame, Burch,		, , , , , ,				<u> </u>	
Columbia County, Georgia	1:18-op-45607	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Columbia County, Georgia	1:18-op-45607	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
,· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1:18-op-45607	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
County of McCracken,									
	1:18-op-45611	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
County of McCracken, KY	1:18-op-45611	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		N/ - 51 10/0/00 W
Clallana Causa NA	1.10 - 45613	Kallan Bull. L. L. L. S	V		IO III T !	\ \ 		2/0/2022	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
Clallam County, WA	1:18-op-45612	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	+	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Clallam County, Washington	1:18-op-45612	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Sanam County, Washington	1 oh -2017	Rener Admiback E.E.F.	1.55	I		1.00	1100	3, 20, 2023	. 0.00.10. 001100 periodica 0/ 10/ 2020.

	1	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,			1	1			
		Olstein, Brody &							
Bergen County, NJ	1:18-op-45616	Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	2 Indivior	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
City of Frostburg v.		1 181101107 1 101		==,==,===		1.00			- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1
Amerisourcebergen Drug		Levin Papantonio							
Corporation, et al.	1:18-op-45617	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
		Levin Papantonio							
City of Hagerstown, Maryland	1:18-op-45622	Rafferty	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
City of Hagerstown, Maryland									
v. Amerisourcebergen Drug		Levin Papantonio							
	1:18-op-45622	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
corporation et al.	1.10 OP 43022	Levin Papantonio	1.63		value Drug	103	1 63	3,3,2020	
City of Hagerstown, MD	1:18-op-45622	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	No	3/23/2023	
City of Cumberland, Maryland		1							
v. Amerisourcebergen Drug	4.40 45.634	Levin Papantonio			V.1 - B			F /F /2020	
Corporation et al.	1:18-op-45624	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
					Associated				
		Skikos Crawford Skikos			Pharmacies				A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Associated
		& Joseph			Inc/American				Pharmacies, Inc. on 2/20/23. Counsel for Associated Pharmacies stated in response that it would
Carbon County, WY	1:18-op-45625	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	No	N/A	not execute the waiver of service, but was willing to accept service on the client's behalf.
	·	Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph			Amneal				A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Amneal on
County of Carbon, Wyoming	1:18-op-45625	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on
Carbon County, Wyoming	1:18-op-45625	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph	.,						A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Hikma on
County of Carbon, Wyoming	1:18-op-45625	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Hikma	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23. The request was denied by Hikma.
Arizona Counties Insurance Pool	1:18-op-45632	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
1 001	1.10 OP 43032	Rener Rombuck E.E.I.	1.63		KVK TCCII	103	1 63	3/0/2023	signed and recarried 5/5/2025.
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
The Arizona Counties					Inc/American				
Insurance Pool	1:18-op-45632	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
									PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these
									pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on
									3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted
									Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the
									folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on
									3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format
									of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one
									pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the
									PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
		Friedman, Dazzio &							reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
City of Bridgeport (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
									PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these
									pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on
									3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted
									Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the
									folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on
									3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one
									pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the
									PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
		Friedman, Dazzio &							reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
City of Henagar (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
,			1	3, 3, 202.		1.00		Ĺ	1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -

T	1	Т	1	1		T	T	
City of New Hope (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Scottsboro (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Jackson County (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Jackson County, Alabama et al.	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Jackson County, Alabama; City of Bridgeport, Alabama; City of Henagar, Alabama; City of New Hope, Alabama; City of Scottsboro, Alabama; Town of Geraldine, Alabama; Town of Woodville, Alabama	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

	T-								
Town of Geraldine (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
(3,2,222					, and a second part of the secon
Town of Woodville (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Jackson County, AL, Cities of Bridgeport, Henagar, New Hope, and Scottsboro, AL, and Towns of Geraldine and Woodville, AL	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Mayfield Heights, Ohio	1:19 on 45625	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Mulan	Voc	In Process		
City of Mayrield Heights, Offic	1.16-0p-45055	Kelley & Perraro	No	2/17/2023	iviyiaii	Yes	In Process		
City of Mayfield Heights, OH	1:18-op-45635	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023		Yes	In Process		
	1:18-op-45636	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023		Yes	In Process		
City of Lyndhurst, OH	1:18-op-45636	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023		Yes	In Process		
	1:18-op-45637	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023		Yes	In Process		
<u> </u>	1:18-op-45637	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Allegany County, Maryland v.									
Amerisourcebergen Drug		Levin Papantonio	.,				.,	- /- /aaaa	
Corporation et al.	1:18-op-45652	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 13, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity — Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. — with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 51. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has
0		Robbins Geller Rudman						0.14=1===	been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural
County of Marin, California	1:18-op-45657	& Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
City of Winston-Salem (NC)	1:18-op-45658	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
		Levin Papantonio							
Dallas County, AL	1:18-op-45667	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
	1:18-op-45669	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Osceola, Florida	1:18-op-45669	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	

	1	•	_			,		
		Levin Papantonio						
Wilkinson County (GA)	1:18-op-45671	Rafferty	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	03/02/2023	
				Associated				
				Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio		Inc/American				
Monroe County, GA	1:18-op-45672	Rafferty	Yes	Associated Pharmacie	es Yes	Yes	03/02/2023	
		Levin Papantonio				.,		
Monroe County, GA	1:18-op-45672	Rafferty	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/15/2021	
		Levin Papantonio				.,		
Town of Watertown, MA	1:18-op-45674	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/19/2020	
								Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 12, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and
								Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan
								Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 64. CMO 1
								suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service,
								Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff
								also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has
		Robbins Geller Rudman						been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural
County of Santa Cruz, California	1:18-op-45679	& Dowd LLP	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
				Associated				
				Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio		Inc/American				
Dare County, NC	1:18-op-45683	Rafferty	Yes	Associated Pharmacie	es Yes	Yes	8/15/2019	
		Levin Papantonio						
City of Wilmington (NC)	1:18-op-45684	Rafferty	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
Alachua County, Florida	1:18-op-45685	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	
, ·	1:18-op-45685	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
	1.10 op .5005	Levin Papantonio		,	1		2/ 20/ 2020	
Town of Southbridge, MA	1:18-op-45686	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/19/2020	
Term of Seattle lage, in t	2.20 00 .5000	Levin Papantonio		NVN Teen			11/13/2020	
Town of Winchendon, MA	1:18-op-45687	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/18/2020	
Town or Willemendon, WA	1.10 Op 43007	Levin Papantonio	163	KVK TCCII	103	103	11/10/2020	
Town of Charlton, MA	1:18-op-45689	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
	1:18-op-45692	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023 Amneal	No	163	11/23/2020	A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
	1:18-op-45692	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023 Airinear 1/3/2023 Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
	1:18-op-45692	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023 Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Logansport, IN	1:18-op-45692	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023 Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Logarisport, in	1.16-0p-43032	Levin Papantonio	INO	1/3/2023 IIIdiVi0i	INO			A FF3 was originally served our 12/17/2018
City of Holyaka NAA	1:10 an 45004	· ·	Vec	WW Took	Vas	Voc	11/24/2020	
City of Holyoke, MA	1:18-op-45694	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/24/2020	
								The DECountry like the result of the result
								The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and
Dana Caraka kadian Calami								fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In
Reno-Sparks Indian Colony,								addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
Nevada	1:18-op-45699			Hikma	No			Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
		Levin Papantonio						
St. Petersburg, FL	1:18-op-45701	Rafferty	Yes	Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
		Levin Papantonio						
City of North Adams (MA)	1:18-op-45702	Rafferty	Yes	Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	12/7/2020	
		Levin Papantonio						
Town of Douglas, MA	1:18-op-45706	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
		Levin Papantonio						
Town of Dudley, MA	1:18-op-45707	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/20/2020	
		Levin Papantonio						
Town of Hopedale, MA	1:18-op-45708	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/20/2020	
	1	Levin Papantonio						
City of Leominster, MA	1:18-op-45710	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/24/2020	
	1	Levin Papantonio						
Town of Northbridge, MA	1:18-op-45711	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/19/2020	
<u>-</u> ·		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Dooly County (GA)	1:18-op-45712	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,		·				
Dooly County, Georgia	1:18-op-45712	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
- ,,,,		Blasingame, Burch,	1	, - ,	 			
Dooly County, Georgia	1:18-op-45712	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
	110 OP 10/12	carrait a risiney, rici	1	2-, 2-, 2-022 111 11011	1	l .	I .	I e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

		Blasingame, Burch,							
Dooly County, Georgia	1:18-op-45712	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
	·	Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Charlton County (GA)	1:18-op-45713	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 5/5/20.
					A				
					Associated Pharmacies				
		Blasingame, Burch,			Inc/American				Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/23/19.
Charlton County, GA	1:18-op-45713	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Associated Pharma	acies Yes	Yes	5/23/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
,	,	Blasingame, Burch,			, ,			-, -, -	
Charlton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45713	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Charlton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45713	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,			42/42/2022				
Charlton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45713	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No		12/13/2022 Amneal	No			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Brantley County (GA)	1:18-op-45714	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 1/30/20.
bruntiey country (G/1)	1.10 Op +37 14	Blasingame, Burch,	110		12/13/2022 311 3111(1)	163	163	4/25/2015	Trainer fred the warrer with the court on 1750/20.
Brantley County, Georgia	1:18-op-45714	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Brantley County, Georgia	1:18-op-45714	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Brantley County, Georgia	1:18-op-45714	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Amneal	No			Defendent signal and actions of the continuous A /25 /40
Troup County (GA)	1:18-op-45715	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Troup County (GA)	1.16-0p-45715	Blasingame, Burch,	INO		12/14/2022 JIVI SIIII(II	res	res	4/23/2019	Plaintin filed the waiver with the court on 2/6/25.
Troup County, Georgia	1:18-op-45715	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Troup County, Georgia	1:18-op-45715	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Troup County, Georgia	1:18-op-45715	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,			10/11/2020 11.5			1/25/2010	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Johnson County (GA)	1:18-op-45716	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No		12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Johnson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45716	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
Johnson County, Georgia	1.10 00 43710	Blasingame, Burch,	110		12/11/2022 1110110	110			
Johnson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45716	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Johnson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45716	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						. /== /== . =	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19.
Camden County (GA)	1:18-op-45717	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/12/20.
Camden County, Georgia	1:18-op-45717	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Hikma	No			
Camaen County, Georgia	1.16-0p-43717	Blasingame, Burch,	INO		12/13/2022 11111116	140			
Camden County, Georgia	1:18-op-45717	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Mylan	No			
, ,	·	Blasingame, Burch,							
Camden County, Georgia	1:18-op-45717	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Amneal	No			
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
0		& Joseph	.,		Amneal				A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Amneal on
County of Reno, Kansas	1:18-op-45718	Ochs Law Firm Skikos Crawford Skikos	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals L	LC Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23.
		& Joseph							A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on
Reno County, Kansas	1:18-op-45718	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
,,	1.10 00 .0710		1.22	14.1	,	100		1477	-,,
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
Lincoln County, NC	1:18-op-45719	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharm	acies Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
Facembia County 51	1.10 on 45720	Levin Papantonio	Vos		Minne Dist	Va -	V	12/10/2020	
Escampia County, FL	1:18-0p-45/29	каттегту	res		winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
									The PFC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and
									fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In
Nez Perce Tribe, ID v. Purdue									addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
·	1:18-op-45730				SuperValu	No			Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Escambia County, FL Nez Perce Tribe, ID v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45729 1:18-op-45730	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie SuperValu	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to

	T		1		T	1			т
Nez Perce Tribe, ID v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45730	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.		N/A	SuperValu	No			Plaintiff is a Tribe and was incorrectly listed by Defendant on Defendant's service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. Defendant does not contend that it was not served with process. In addition, as Defendant expressly acknowledges (see #4836 at 2), the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
		Levin Papantonio		,	'				
Chilton County, AL	1:18-op-45735	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/7/2020	
(1) Consider County, CO.									
(1) Conejos County, CO;(2) Las Animas County, CO;(3) Chafee County, CO;					Associated				
(4) Otero County, CO;		Speights, Worrich,			Pharmacies				The solution of the solution o
(5) Alamosa County, CO; and (6) City of Alamosa, CO	1:18-op-45740	Newcomb, Roth & Mitchell LLC	Yes		Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Vac	In Process		Thought that we had effectuated service, as we did with the other defendants, but it appears that we did not.
(b) city of Alamosa, co	1.18-0p-43740	Levin Papantonio	163		Associated Filarifiacies	163	III r rocess		we did not.
Pinellas County, FL	1:18-op-45742	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	
		Levin Papantonio							
Seneca Nation	1:18-op-45746	Rafferty	No		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	3/6/2023	Tribes were not required to submit PFS.
Cabarrus County (NC)	1.10 on 45747	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/18/2022	IN 4 Consists	No			
Cabarrus County (NC)	1:18-op-45747	LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Associated Pharmacies Inc/American				
Cabarrus County, NC	1:18-op-45747	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies	No			
The Blackfeet Tribe of The Blackfeet Indian Reservation, MT v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	1:18-op-45749				SuperValu	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
		Levin Papantonio							
Blackfeet Tribe	1:18-op-45749	Rafferty	No		SuperValu	Yes	Yes	8/27/2020	Tribes were not required to submit PFS.
Blackfeet Tribe	1:18-op-45749	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No		N/A	Tribes were not required to submit PFS.
County of Napa, CA	1:18-op-45750	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Novartis AG	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 12, 2019, naming Novartis AG, Sandoz International GmbH, and Sandoz Inc. On April 18, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Sandoz Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 57. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Novartis AG to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Novartis AG care of Sandoz Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Novartis has been on notice since April 18, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Novartis AG have been effectively cured.
County of Napa, CA	1:18-op-45750	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 12, 2019, naming Novartis AG, Sandoz International GmbH, and Sandoz Inc. On April 18, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Sandoz Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 57. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Sandoz International GmbH to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Sandoz International GmbH care of Sandoz Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Sandoz has been on notice since April 18, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Sandoz International GmbH have been effectively cured.
Napa County, California	1:18-op-45750	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 12, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, they served the domestic entity – Sandoz Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. <i>See</i> Dkt. No. 56. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiffs also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.

Second Control Contr		1	1	1		1	1	T		
A month of the color of the c										
Anterior Part Par					- / /					
Manuscriptories Manuscript	St. Bernard Parish Government	1:18-OP-45756	Gernhauser, Jr., LLC	Yes	3/27/2023	TopRx	Yes	In Process		
Manuscriptories Manuscript										
M. Promission 1.0 deg 40755 March Section 1.0 deg 4075										
State Stat										
Name of Locals 1.5	· ·			.,	0 /0= /000	•	l.,			
Section 1.00	Government	1:18-op-45756	Gernhauser, Jr., LLC	Yes	3/27/2023	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		
Section 1.00										
Control County (Europe) 18-99-2579				.,	0 /0 = /0 0 0		l.,			
Control Lings 1989 298 Control Lings 1989	Government, LA	1:18-op-45756	Gernhauser, Jr., LLC	Yes	3/2//2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Copy of Secretary (Copy of Secretary Copy of S										
March Marc									2/12/222	receipt of signed waiver
Moderal Country (MCC) 18 to 0.48774 18 t	City of Parma Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45//3		Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Interest Country, No. 238-99-67-78 LC	(1)(2)	4.40 45774		la.	44 /40 /2022	10.4.6		v	5 /20 /2040	
Principle Prin	Iredell County (NC)	1:18-op-45//4	LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/30/2019	
Principle Prin										
International Part Second House										
			61							
11-0-4775 11-0					/ /					
State County (SSS) 15 to 6.4775	Iredell County, NC	1:18-op-45774		No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies	No			
Sear of Control (Sear of Sear of Sea	61 6 (2.50)	4.40				In 4 C			40/0/2010	
County of Sun 1,50% - 170				Yes		JIM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/9/2019	
Perfect County (MS) 1,18-0-4778 Safferty Yes Quest Pharmacelocids Yes 1,197,2000					11/10/200		l			
Perform 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 1	County of Santa Fe, NM	1:18-op-45776		No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Non-Paper Non-										
County of Volutia Till Supplementation S	Perry County (MS)	1:18-op-45778		Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	10/9/2019	
County of Volcaia, F. 1.15-op-45782 Refer by Ves Winn-Dixie Ves Ves 1/1/7/2020										
County of Volunia F 18-9-4782 Afferty Vest 11/17/2000 Afferty Vest 11/17/2000 Afferty Ministration Minis	County of Volusia (FL)	1:18-op-45782		Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/17/2020	
Hotmore Country (MC) 1:18-up-45793 Referry Ves M. Smith Ves Ves ID/3/2019										
Mome County (Not 18-09-5793 Safetry Vest Mome Mome Vest Vest Mome	County of Volusia, FL	1:18-op-45782		Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/17/2020	
Segme County (Co.) 13.60 p-45.597 Referv Ves Manith Ves Ves 5/11/2019										
Rown County (No.) 1.80 op 45799 of 120 op 45790 of 120	Holmes County (MS)	1:18-op-45793	-	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/3/2019	
Perfuls Park, 18. op 45807 84rty Ves Ves Ves Ves 1/18/2020										
Pinella Park, F. 136-op-48807 Safferty Wes Winn-Duke Yes Yes 21/8/2020	Rowan County (NC)	1:18-op-45799		Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Community (GA) 1:18 op 45817 U.C No 11/18/2022 M.Smith No										
Cobb County (CA) 118-op-45817 U.C No 1/18/2022 M. Smith No No Company Compan	Pinellas Park, FL	1:18-op-45807		Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
13 Bor Secours Health System, Inc.; 2) Our Lady of Bellefonte Hysician Services, Inc. 128-op-45819 The Finnell Firm No N/A Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Services, Inc. 128-op-45819 The Finnell Firm No N/A Associated Pharmacies Yes Yes 6/3/2019										
Inc.; 2 Dour tady of Bellefonte Hospital, Inc.; 2 and [3] Bellefonte Physician Services, Inc. 118 op 45819 The Finnell Firm No No N/A Associated Pharmacies to the Pharmacies		1:18-op-45817	LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
2) Our Lady of Bellefonte Rospital, Inc.; and Spelicions Physician Services, Inc. 118-op-45819 The Finnell Firm No N/A Associated Pharmacies N/A N/A Associated Pharma										
Hospital, Inc.; and (3) Bellefonte Physician Services, Inc. (1) Bon Secours Health System, Inc.; (2) Bon Secours Pleath System, Inc.; (3) Bon Secours DePaul Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours — Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours — Study & Florida (1) Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours — Study & Florida (1) Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours — Study & Florida (1) Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours — Study & Florida (1) Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours — Study & Florida (1) Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours — Virginal Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital (1) Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and	•									
3) Belleforte Physician 18-op-45819 The Finnell Firm No N/A Associated Pharmacies Ves Ves 6/3/2019										
Services, Inc. 1:18-op-45819 The Finnell Firm No N/A Associated Pharmacies Yes Yes 6/3/2019 (1) Bon Secours Health System, Inc.; (2) Bon Secours - Richmond Community Hospital, Incorporated; (3) Bon Secours - Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours - Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours - St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours - Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and	Hospital, Inc.; and									
(1) Bon Secours Health System, Inc.; (2) Bon Secours – Richmond Community Hospital, Incorporated; (3) Bon Secours bePaul Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours - Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours – St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsoure, Inc.; (7) Chesspaek Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and									- /- /	
Inc.; (2) Bon Secours — Richmond Community Hospital, Incorporated; (3) Bon Secours DePaul Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours — Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours — St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours — St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and (9) Fharmacies Inc/American	Services, Inc.	1:18-op-45819	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Inc.; (2) Bon Secours — Richmond Community Hospital, Incorporated; (3) Bon Secours DePaul Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours — Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours — St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours — St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and (9) Fharmacies Inc/American										
Inc.; (2) Bon Secours — Richmond Community Hospital, Incorporated; (3) Bon Secours DePaul Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours — Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours — St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours — St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and (9) Fharmacies Inc/American										
(2) Bon Secours — Richmond Community Hospital, Incorporated; (3) Bon Secours DePaul Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours — Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours — St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours — Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and in corporated; and in corporated; and in corporated; and in corporated and in corporated and in corporated in corporated; and in corporated										
Community Hospital, Incorporated; (3) 8 on Secours DePaul Medical Center, Inc.; (4) 8 on Secours – Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) 8 on Secours – St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and (9) Associated Inc./ American Inc./ I										
Incorporated; (3) Bon Secours DePaul Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours – Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours – St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and										
(3) Bon Secours DePaul Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours – Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours – St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and										
Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours – Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours – St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and										
(4) Bon Secours – Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours – St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and Incorporated; and Incorporated; and Incorporated										
Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours – St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and										
(5) Bon Secours – St. Mary's Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and										
Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and										
(6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and										
Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and										
(7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and										
Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies Inc/American										
(8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and Incorporated and Incorporated in Incorporated						[
Incorporated; and Inc/American Inc/American										
(9) Maryview Hospital 1:18-op-45820 The Finnell Firm No N/A Associated Pharmacies Yes 6/11/2019						I -			6/44/06:5	
	(9) Maryview Hospital	1:18-op-45820	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	6/11/2019	

		1			Г	1		1	
(1) Bon Secours Health System,									
Inc.; (2) Bon Secours - St.									
Francis Zavier Hospital, Inc.; (3)					Associated				
St. Francis Hospital, Inc.; and					Pharmacies, Inc. and				
(4) St. Francfis Physicia					American Assoicated				
-	1:18-op-45821	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	6/11/2019	
Bon Secours Health System,									
Inc., et al v. Purdue Pharma									
L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45822	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	
									The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and
									fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In
Chitimacha Tribe of					Louisiana Wholesale				addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
-	1:18-op-45825				Drug	Yes			Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
· ·	1:18-op-45828	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No		Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
	1:18-op-45828	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
· ·	1:18-op-45828	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Morgan County, IN	1:18-op-45828	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
San Juan County, NM	1:18-op-45829	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Levin Papantonio							
Adams County (MS)	1:18-op-45831	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Green Lake County, WI	1:18-op-45832	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Green Lake County, Wisconsin	1:18-op-45832	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Green Lake County, WI et al	1:18-op-45832	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Taylor County, WI	1:18-op-45832	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Vilas County, WI	1:18-op-45832	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
									emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending
Berrien County (GA)	1:18-op-45834	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed Waiver
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
					Inc/American				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Associated
Berrien County, GA	1:18-op-45834	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		Pharmacies; pending receipt of signed waiver
									emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for Mylan Inc.; pending
Berrien County, Georgia	1:18-op-45834	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed waiver
Berrien County, Georgia v.									
Amerisourcebergen Drug					Amneal				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal
Corporaiton, et al.	1:18-op-45834	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
	·								emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 23, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending
Lowndes County (GA)	1:18-op-45835	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed waiver
	·								emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for Mylan Inc.; pending
Lowndes County, Georgia	1:18-op-45835	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed waiver
"	•	Levin Papantonio			,				1 0
City of Newburyport, MA	1:18-op-45837	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/8/2020	
7,		1 1 1 1						, , , , ,	
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
					Inc/American				
Lafayette County, MO	1:18-op-45840	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	7/12/2019	Executed Waiver of Service filed on 7/12/2019, and refiled on 2/16/2023.
,	p					-		. ,	
Jeffrey F. Wiley (Sheriff of		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:18-op-45842	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	+	•	*		•	•	+	•

Substitution of Hander Holland in Control and Service Control and		1	1	I .		ı		1	1	,
Security	1.66 5.400 5.4.5									
10 Concess 10										
Million Mill	· ·									
Section Sect										
Marrie										
March Marc										
Service Moderation 1/4 page (1987) 1/4 pag										
Semble S		1:18-op-45842		No	1/3/2023		Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
County of County Date County of County of County Date			· · · · · ·		. /2 /2 22				44/4/2040	
State Control Accordance Control	Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45842	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Drug	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
State Control Accordance Control	Joffray E. Wilay, Duly Floated									
March Marc	The state of the s									
Office of the Authors Author College C	-									
Second Control Seco										
According Name Control State Control Sta										
International			Simmons Hanly Conroy							
State Control (150 g A 5882) State		1:19 on 45942		No	1/2/2022	IM Smith	No			
March Marc		1.16-0p-43642		INO	1/3/2023	JIVI SIIIICII	INO			
Warry Country, Castast 118-gp-55847 118-gp-558		1·18-on-45842		No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Family LAC 1559 4382		1.16-0p-43642		INO	1/3/2023	Iviyiaii	INO			
Country of Sonora, California 18 op-15829 Solor Grand of Salks Harvey County, Kanas 18 op-15849 Solor Grand of Salks Anequest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner of service pursuant to 1967 Page 4(3) and CMO-2 was circulated for Mydan or Anguest for swinner or Swinner and Swinner Anguest for swinner or Swinner Anguest for swinner or Swinner Anguest for swinner or Swinner Anguest for swinner and Swinner Anguest for swinner or Swinner Anguest for swinner and Swinner Anguest for swinner and Swinner Anguest for swinner and Swinner Anguest for Swi		1·18-on-45842		No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Solethe Loundy, No. 18 to 49842 Seffery es No. No. es P\$/2019 Seffery es Solethe Loundy, Seffery Solethe Solet	Turistry, EA	1.10-0p-43042		NO	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	NO			
Sixion Careford Skillow 1 18-op-55649 Ools for Minn 1 18-op-55649 Ools f	Columbus County NC	1·18-on-45847	·	Vec		KVK-Tech	Ves	Vec	9/10/2019	
As sooph of the part of the pa	columbus county, we	1.10 op 43047	,	163		KVK TCCII	103	163	3/10/2013	
136 pp 43688 of the insure from processing states of the insure from processing state										A request for waiver of service pursuant to ERCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on
Second Country (Amena) 118-op-45848 Second Country (Amena) 118-op-45848 Second Country (Amena) 118-op-45848 Second Country (Amena) 118-op-45848 Second Country (Amena) Second Co	Harvey County, Kansas	1:18-op-45848	•	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	
A Joseph County, Kansoa 18 8 A Joseph County, Kansoa 18 8 Octob Law Himm Yes No. NA. 27/17/231 htt request two activities and to Hilliams on Heavy County, Kansoa 18 8 Octob Law Himm Yes No. NA. 27/17/231 htt request two depended by Hikman on Heavy County, Kansoa 18 18 Octob Law Himm Yes No. NA. 27/17/231 htt request two depended by Hikman on Heavy County of Sonoma, California 19 28-04-5891 8 Octob Law California 19 28-04-5891 Reference of Manipulation of Heavy California 19 28-04-5891 Reference of Manipulation 19 28-04-5891 Refer	marrey souncy, nameus	2.25 op 155 to		. 65	1.47.	,		1.10	14/11	2/27/25 The request was defined by implain
Harvey County, Karnase 138 op 45648 See										A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Hikma on
Riantiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2015, naming Mylan N.V. (Fl/2) Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticis Inc. On April 22, 2019, it served the consists entity - Mylan Pharmaceuticis Inc. On April 22, 2019, it served the consists entity - Mylan N.V. (Fl/2) Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticis Inc. On April 22, 2019, it served the consists entity - Mylan N.V. (Fl/2) Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticis Inc. On April 22, 2019, it served the consists entity - Mylan N.V. (Fl/2) Mylan Inc. and Entity Inc. 2006 (Inc. 2006)	Harvey County, Kansas	1:18-op-45848	'	Yes	N/A	Hikma	Yes	No	N/A	
Mylan Ves Ves 37/2023 Service to basis related to Mylan NV. coarse of Mylan NV. to case of control from an Operative complant. See DLK. No. S.C. CMD 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan NV. to coarsel of record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. to coarsel of record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. to coarsel of record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. to coarsel of record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. to caused for record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. to caused for record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 118-op-45899 8 Dewel LIP Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45851 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45852 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				.,,			1	1411	
Mylan Ves Ves 37/2023 Service to basis related to Mylan NV. coarse of Mylan NV. to case of control from an Operative complant. See DLK. No. S.C. CMD 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan NV. to coarsel of record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. to coarsel of record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. to coarsel of record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. to coarsel of record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. to caused for record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. to caused for record which counted deemed. Plaintiff sent as waiver request for Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 118-op-45899 8 Dewel LIP Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45851 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45852 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety Ves Mylan NV. there been effectively cured. 128-op-45853 And Feety										Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and
Pasco County, File 118 op 45851 Refervy Per Mynamus County, Maryland, Caroline, County, Maryland, County, Maryland, Caroline, County, Maryland, Caroline, County, Maryland, Caroline, County, Maryland, County, Maryland, County, Maryland, Caroline, County, Maryland, County, Maryland, County, Maryland, Croline, County, Maryland, County, Maryland, County, Maryland, County, Maryland, County, Maryland, County, Maryland, Productive, County, Maryland, County,										
September 1.18-op-45869 Supplemental September 1.18-op-45861 Supplemental September 1										
Sobbins Geller Rudman County of Snorma, California 118-09-45849 8 Dowd LIP Ves Mylan Na Pasco County (FL) 118-09-45851 8 Alfferty Ves Mylan Na Pasco County, Maryland; Carrett										suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service,
Sobbins Geller Rudman County of Snorma, California 118-09-45849 8 Dowd LIP Ves Mylan Na Pasco County (FL) 118-09-45851 8 Alfferty Ves Mylan Na Pasco County, Maryland; Carrett										Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff
County of Sonoma, California 1:18-op-45894 & Dowd LIP Yes Wes 37/2023 ervice issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured. Pacco County (FL) 1:18-op-45851 Rafferty Yes IM Smith Yes Yes 12/14/2020 Pacco County, FL 1:18-op-45851 Rafferty Yes Winn-Dioie Yes Yes 12/14/2020 Harford County, Maryland; Caroline County, Maryland; Carolin										also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Mylan has
Pasco County (FL) 1.18-op-45851 Rafferty Yes Minn-Dixie Yes Ves 1.7/14/2020 Rafferty Yes Minn-Dixie Yes Yes 1.7/14/2020 Rafferty Yes Ninn-Dixie Yes 1.7/14/2020 Rafferty Yes Ninn-Dixie Yes 1.7/14/2020 Rafferty Paintiff field its short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. (FW) Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 11, 2019, its served the domestic entity — Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 11, 2019, its served the domestic entity — Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 11, 2019, its parent the domestic entity — Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 11, 2019, its parent the domestic entity — Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 11, 2019, its parent the domestic entity — Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On Epitural 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan Inc. and Table County, Maryland; City of Rockville, Maryland; City of Roc			Robbins Geller Rudman							been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural
Pasco County, FL 1:18-op-45851 Rafferty Yes Winn-Dixie Yes Yes 1:18-op-45851 Rafferty Yes Winn-Dixie Yes Yes 1:18-op-45851 Rafferty Yes Winn-Dixie Yes Yes 1:2/14/2020 Rafferty Residence of the second of	County of Sonoma, California	1:18-op-45849	& Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
Pasco County, FL 1:8-op-45851 Rafferty Ves Winn-Dixie Yes Ves 12/14/2020 Harford County, Maryland; Carrelite County, Maryland; Carrelite County, Maryland; Carrelite County, Maryland; Frederick County, Maryland; Tablot Co			Levin Papantonio							
Pasco County, FL 128-op-45851 Rafferry Yes Winn-Dible Yes Yes 12/14/2020 Rafferry Yes 12/14/2020 Rafferry Yes Rafferry Yes Rafferry Yes Winn-Dible Yes Yes 12/14/2020 Rafferry Yes Rafferry Yes Rafferry Yes Rafferry Yes Rafferry Yes Winn-Dible Yes Yes 12/14/2020 Rafferry Yes Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Yes Rafferry Yes Rafferry Yes Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Yes Rafferry Yes Rafferry Yes Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Rafferry Yes Rafferry Raffe	Pasco County (FL)	1:18-op-45851	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/14/2020	
Harford County, Maryland; Garrett County, Maryland; Garrett County, Maryland; Garrett County, Maryland; Frederick County, Maryland; Tailbot County, Tailbot Sailbot Tailbot Ta			· ·							
Caroline County, Maryland; Garrett County, Maryland; Frederick County, Maryland; Talbot County, Maryland; Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 11, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan The Maryland;	Pasco County, FL	1:18-op-45851	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/14/2020	
Caroline County, Maryland; Garrett County, Maryland; Frederick County, Maryland; Talbot County, Maryland; Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 11, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan The Maryland;										
Garrett County, Maryland; Frederick, County, Maryland; City of Frederick, Maryland; City of Frederick, Maryland; the Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, Maryland; City of Boxie, Maryland; City of Pharmaceuticals inc. on April 11, 2019, its event deep included. Any procedural Section of Boxie, Maryland; City of Boxie, Maryland; City of Pharmaceuticals inc. on April 11, 2019, and nas not been prejudiced. Any procedural Section of Pharmaceuticals inc. on April 11, 2019, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural Section of Abold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of Council City of Pharmaceuticals inc. on April 11, 2019, and has not been prejudic	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *									
Frederick County, Maryland; Tailbot County, Tailbot, To Maryland; Tailbot County, Maryland; Tailbot County, Tailbot, To Maryland; Tailbot County, Tailbot, Tailbot, To Maryland, Tailbot, To Maryland, Tailbot, Tailbo										
Talbot County, Maryland; City of Frederick, Maryland; the Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, Maryland; City of Bowle, Maryland; City of Bowl	,, ,									
of Frederick, Maryland; the Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, Maryland; City of Bowie, Maryland, City of Bowie, Maryland; City of Bowie, Maryland; City of Bowie, Maryland, City of Bowie, Maryland, Conference of Mylan N.V. core of Myla										
Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, Maryland; City of Bowie, Maryland; City of Bowie, Maryland; City of Bowie, Maryland; City of Bowie, Maryland; the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Robbins Geller Rudman And Council of Rockville, Maryland 1:18-op-45853 & Dowd LLP Yes Mylan N.Y. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff of Bowie, Maryland; the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland 1:18-op-45853 & Dowd LLP Yes Mylan N.Y. was peen on notice since April 11, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.Y. have been effectively cured. Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.Y., Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. On April 11, 2019, the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record, Plaintiffs also served Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to the domestic entities of the Amore of Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served to Mylan N.V. to counsel of										
Westminster, Maryland; City of Bowie, Maryland; the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland 1:18-op-45853 & Dowd LLP Yes Mylan Per Yes Yes 2/17/2023 Service issues related to Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 11, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured. Plaintiffs ent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 11, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service of international deficiency and control of the service of international definitions and operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs selo service Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also service Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to scove of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. has been on notice since April 11, 2019 and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to	· · ·									· · ·
of Bowie, Maryland; the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland 1:18-op-45853 Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP Yes Mylan Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes 2/17/2023 Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V., Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. — with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23, Adametracy of Ahold Dehaize N.V. to consel of record. Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to consel of record. Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales company, Inc. — with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23. Thus, Mylan has not been on notice since April 11, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. care of Mylan N.	· ·									_ ·
and Council of Rockville, Maryland 1:18-op-45853 Robbins Geller Rudman Maryland 1:18-op-45853 Robbins Geller Rudman Maryland Nylan Yes Yes Yes 2/17/2023 Robbins Geller Rudman Maryland Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V., Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. On April 11, 2019, they served the domestic entities – Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. — with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent of Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of Robbins Geller Rudman Koninklijke Ahold										
Maryland 1:18-op-45853 & Dowd LLP Yes Mylan Yes Yes 2/17/2023 service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured. Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V., Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. — with the short form and operative complaint. Following this Court's See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V has been on notice since April 11, 2019 and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to	-									
Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V., Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. On April 11, 2019, they served the domestic entities – Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dist. Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of intentional defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V has been on Robbins Geller Rudman Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold	,	4.40 45052					W	v	2/47/2022	
N.V., Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. On April 11, 2019, they served the domestic entities – Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V has been on Robbins Geller Rudman Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold	Maryland	1:18-op-45853	& Dowa LLP	Yes		iviyian	Yes	Yes	2/1//2023	service issues related to Mylan N.V. nave been effectively cured.
N.V., Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. On April 11, 2019, they served the domestic entities – Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V has been on Robbins Geller Rudman Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold										Disintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2010, non-time March 15, 1010
domestic entities – Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V has been on Robbins Geller Rudman Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold										
operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V has been on Robbins Geller Rudman Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold										
Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V has been on Robbins Geller Rudman Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold										
Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V has been on Robbins Geller Rudman Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold										
of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V has been on Robbins Geller Rudman Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold Koninklijke Ahold										
Robbins Geller Rudman Koninklijke Ahold notice since April 11, 2019 and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to										*
			Robbins Geller Rudman			Koninkliike Abold				-
permate introduce introduc	Harford County MD	1:18-op-45853		Yes			Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
	,,		1		1		, - -	1	1-,-,	The state of the s

			<u> </u>		T	1			
					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Cochise County, Arizona	1:18-op-45855	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Cochise County, Arizona	1:18-op-45855	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
,	·				,				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Cochise County, Arizona	1:18-op-45855	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
,,	·							, ,	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
Cochise County, AZ	1:18-op-45855	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Santa Rosa County (FL)	1:18-op-45861	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	
						100		==,==,===	
					Masters				In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Montcalm, MI	1:18-op-45865	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	2 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
County of Montcalm, Michigan	1:18-op-45865	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	2 Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
County of Houghton MI	1:18-on-45966	Waitz & Luyanhara	No	12/1/2022	Masters	Voc	Ves	5/21/2019	indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Houghton, MI	1:18-op-45866	Weitz & Luxenberg	INO	12/1/2022	2 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	2/21/2013	pianiuns.

		1							
County of Houghton, Michigan	1:18-op-45866	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
County of Cass, MI	1:18-op-45868	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Cass, MI County of Cass, Michigan	1:18-op-45868 1:18-op-45868	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No No	12/1/2022 12/1/2022		Yes No	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
					Masters				In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Tuscola, MI	1:18-op-45870	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
County of Tuscola, Michigan	1:18-op-45870	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

## 2019 with file of minutes, in count for the processor of authority of the processor of author	
each afford of arrange, its horseled but the person acreal designed in the person acreal designe	
County of Alpena, M. 138-op-45871 Weltz & Luxenberg No 127/2/2022 Pharmaceutical Ves No	served identified themselves as a d. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's at's more, in the more than three and a half a allegation that W&L's clients' service was ervice is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in ats for good cause as to W&L's alleged or a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be ence[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, acoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, attered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if eded to serve Masters to begin with is only ervice. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the floc)) obligate defendants to waive service hroughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought in ewalled these efforts without cause and ess server. This refusal to waive service, ag actual notice via waiver request that it was
County of Algenta, Mrl 118-op-45872 West & Lumenberg No 127/7/202 Pharmaceuscular Ves Ves 5/21/2019 plaintiffs.	
September Sept	, , ,
North Maint F. 138-p-43872 Itafferty Ves Winn-Doke Ves Ves 12/8/2020	
Mismi Sardens, FL 1.18 op 45878 Lisenberg Molt required: Dist. Molt required: Dis	
Miami Gardens, FL 138 op -45873 Rafferty Ves Not required; Dtt. Passamaquody Tribe-indian 138 op -45876 Weitz & Luxenberg Not 638, Dkt. 642 2ydus Ves No	
Passamaquody Tribe-Indian Township 128-op-45876 Weitz & Luxenberg No 638, Rkt. 642 Zydus Ves No	
Passamaguoddy Tribe-Indian Township Tow	
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Indian Township Township Passamaquoddy Tribe-Indian Township Township Passamaquoddy Tribe-Indian Township Township Township Passamaquoddy Tribe-Indian Township Township Township Passamaquoddy Tribe-Indian Township Tow	
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Indian Township, Mt V. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. 1:18-op-45876 Weitz & Luxenberg Simmons Hanly Conroy, County of Riverside, CA 1:18-op-45878 LLC No 11/18/2022 Dakota Drug Yes Not Named in Complaint Levin Papantonio Rafferty Yes Burlington Drug Yes Yes 4/8/2021 Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in His Capacity Sofficer Ex Officio of the Morehouse Parish Law Enforcement District 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 11/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Michael Tubbs, (Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), Louisiana Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), Louisiana Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, Louisiana Lit8-op-45884 LLC No 11/3/2023 Hikma No 11/3/	re than 90 days after API/AAP was named.
Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 645 SuperValu No No Not Named in Complaint Simmons Hanly Conroy, County of Riverside, CA 1:18-op-45878 LLC No 11/18/2022 Dakota Drug Yes Not Named in Complaint Town of Clarksburg (MA) 1:18-op-45882 Rafferty Yes Burlington Drug Yes Yes 4/8/2021 Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish In Morehouse Parish Law Enforcement District 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 11/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes SHC Not Pursuing Michael Tubbs (Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), Louisiana 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 11/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes SHC Not Pursuing Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish Louisiana 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 11/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes SHC Not Pursuing Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, Louisiana 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 11/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes SHC Not Pursuing Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, Louisiana 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 11/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes SHC Not Pursuing	
Pharma L.P., et al. 1:18-op-45876 Weitz & Luxenberg No 638, Dkt. 645 SuperValu No	
County of Riverside, CA 1:18-op-45878 Levin Papantonio Town of Clarksburg (MA) 1:18-op-45882 Rafferty Yes Burlington Drug Yes Yes 4/8/2021 Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in HIS Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Morehouse Parish Sheriff's Office and the Morehouse Parish Law Enforcement District 1:18-op-45884 LIC No 1/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes Not Named in Complaint Not Named in Com	
Town of Clarksburg (MA) 1:18-op-45882 Levin Papantonio Rafferty Yes Burlington Drug Yes Yes 4/8/2021 Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Morehouse Parish Sheriff of Morehouse Parish Sheriff of Morehouse Parish Law Enforcement District 1:18-op-45884 Luc No 1/3/2023 Hikma No Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in	
Town of Clarksburg (MA) 1:18-op-45882 Rafferty Yes Burlington Drug Yes Yes 4/8/2021 Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Morehouse Parish Sheriff's Office and the Morehouse Parish Law Enforcement District 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 1/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes Yes 4/8/2021 Amneal Amneal Simmons Hanly Conroy, Michael Tubbs (Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), Louisiana Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), In Unisiana Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in	
Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in His Capacity as Office Ex Officio of the Morehouse Parish Sheriff's Office and the Morehouse Parish Law Enforcement District 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 1/3/2023 Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes SHC Not Pursuing SHC Not Pursuing Michael Tubbs (Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), Louisiana 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 1/3/2023 Hikma No Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in	
Morehouse Parish Law Enforcement District 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 1/3/2023 Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes SHC Not Pursuing Michael Tubbs (Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), Louisiana 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 1/3/2023 Hikma No Simmons Hanly Conroy, Morehouse Parish, in Sheriff of Morehouse Parish	
Enforcement District 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 1/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes SHC Not Pursuing Michael Tubbs (Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), Louisiana 1:18-op-45884 LC No 1/3/2023 Hikma No Simmons Hanly Conroy, But Control of Morehouse Parish, in Sheriff	
Michael Tubbs (Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), Louisiana 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 1/3/2023 Hikma No	
Morehouse Parish), Louisiana 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 1/3/2023 Hikma No Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in	
Morehouse Parish), Louisiana 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 1/3/2023 Hikma No Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in	
Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in	
his Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Morehouse Parish Sheriffi's Office and the Morehouse Parish Law Enforcement District (LA) 1:18-op-45884 LLC No 1/3/2023 JM Smith No	

Balabaal Tubba Baaabaaa	1	Ciarana I I anh Canana	1		I aviaiana M/halaaala	1	1		T
Michael Tubbs, Morehouse Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45884	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
ransii silei iii	1.16-0p-43864	LLC	NO	1/3/2023	Drug	163	163	11/1/2019	
Michael Tubbs, Sheriff of		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Morehouse Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45884	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Tubbs (Sheriff of Morehouse		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Parish), LA	1:18-op-45884	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was
									named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
County of Washtonaw MI	1:10 on 4E006	Waitz & Luyanhara	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Voc	Voc	5/21/2019	indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Washtenaw, MI County of Washtenaw,	1:18-op-45886	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	piamuns.
Michigan	1:18-op-45886	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
County of Berrien, MI	1:18-op-45887	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
	·							-,,	
County of Berrien, Michigan	1:18-op-45887	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's
									clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was
									named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
County of Iron, MI	1:18-op-45888	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1:18-op-45888	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		No	103	5,21,2013	pontario.
Country of Clinters Add	1.10 22 45000	Moits 9 Lucys have	Ma	43/4/2000	Masters	Vos	Vos	F (24 /2046	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
County of Clinton, MI	1:18-op-45889	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
County of Clinton, Michigan	1:18-op-45889	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

wetz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Wylan No 12/1/2022 Wy		т		1	T			1	1	
intiligion 1:18-op-45893 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No 1	County of Ontongon, MI	1:18-op-45893	Weitz & Luxenberg	No			Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
In 2019, each of W&L's clients. filed an individual affidant of service in their respective dockets. In each affidant of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Missers Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. A. C.O. *A (1)(1) is satisfied and Wik's clients' service upon Matters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Matters has failed until now to rake the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service was improper. In that w&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's clients' service was improper. In that w&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's clients needed afficiency in under Ohio law, for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance.] if Progressive Direct Ins. C. williams, 18 N B. C. 333, 739 (Ch. C. T. App. 2022) (quoting lung instinction there must be a proper service of summons was netword an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters and properly executed service of properly upon Masters and properly executed service of process upon		1:18-on-45893	Weitz & Luxenherg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
lichigan 1:18-op-45894 Weitz & Luxenberg No 12/1/2022 Mylan No	County of Presque Isle, MI County of Presque Isle,	1:18-op-45894	Weitz & Luxenberg	No			Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
	Michigan	1:18-op-45894	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

					1	1	_	1	
County of St. Clair, MI	1:18-op-45896	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of St. Clair, Wil	1.18-0β-43830	Weitz & Euxemberg	NO	12/1/2022	rnamaceuticai	163	163	3/21/2013	pantins.
County of St. Clair, Michigan	1:18-op-45896	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
County of Charlevoix, MI	1:18-op-45897	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Charlevoix, Michigan	1:18-op-45897	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
		Levin Papantonio		12, 1, 2022					
Polk County (NC)	1:18-op-45900	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/18/2019	

				,				
City of Westland, MI City of Westland, Michigan	1:18-op-45903 1:18-op-45903	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No No	Masters 12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical 12/1/2022 Mylan	Yes No	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Jackson, MI	1:18-op-45904	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Masters 12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Jackson, Michigan	1:18-op-45904	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Mylan	No			
City of Jackson, Michigan Cannon County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45904 1:18-op-45924	LCHB	No No	12/1/2022 Mylan 3/15/2023 Amneal	No No			

			T					
								In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service,
								Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly
				Masters				indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
	1:18-op-45928	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
City of Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan	1:18-op-45928	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Mylan	No			
City of Gary, Indiana	1:18-op-45929	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Gary, Indiana	1:18-op-45929	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Hudson New Jersey	1:18-op-45937	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
County of Hudson, New Jersey	1:18-op-45937	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
County of Hudson, New Jersey	1:18-op-45937	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	In Process		
		Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson						
	1:18-op-45937		Yes	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Humboldt County, California	1:18-op-45942	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Spokane County, Washington	1:18-op-45943	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Franklin County, Washington	1:18-op-45944	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Franklin County, Washington	1:18-op-45944	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.

Case: 1:17-md-02804-DAP Doc #: 4977-1 Filed: 03/29/23 78 of 225. PageID #: 611469

	T			T	T	1		1	
									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Franklin County, Washington	1:18-op-45944	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
		Levin Papantonio							
Laurens County (GA)	1:18-op-45945	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
		Levin Papantonio							
Laurens County, GA	1:18-op-45945	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	3/15/2021	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Houston County (GA)	1:18-op-45946	LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
		Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,							
		Olstein, Brody &							
City of Jersey City, NJ	1:18-op-45948	Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
, , ,		0, -		, , ,					
ı					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
City of New Albany, MS	1.10 an 45040	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Vas	Ves	10/8/2019	
City of New Albany, MS	1:18-op-45949		res		Associated Pharmacies	res	Yes	10/8/2019	
C (C) (F)	4.40	Levin Papantonio			10.4.6			42/20/2020	
Gulf County (FL)	1:18-op-45953	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/29/2020	
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
Gulf County, FL	1:18-op-45953	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/29/2020	
									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Whatcom County, Washington	1:18-op-45954	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
·									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Kitsap County, Washington	1:18-op-45956	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Kitsap County, Washington	1:18-op-45956	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Mylan	No		5/ = 5/ = 5 = 5	,
the second secon	2.20 op .5550	Levin Papantonio	1.00		,,				
Red Lake Band of Chippewa	1:18-op-45959	Rafferty	No		Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	03/03/23	Tribes were not required to submit PFS.
Delaware County, IN	1:18-op-45963	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No	163	03/03/23	A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Delaware County, Indiana	1:18-op-45963	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Delaware County, Indiana	1.16-0p-43303	Corieri & ividiau, LLF	INO	1/3/2023	Ailileai	INO			A FF3 was originally served on 12/17/2016
									A waiver of service request was sent to defense counsel originally on 6/7/2019, but we did not
						1			
						1			receive the signed waiver, even though Defendant returned similar waivers. A renewed waiver of
						1			service has been emailed to Defense counsel but has not been returned. We perfected service via
									process server on 2/21/2023 and filed proof of service in the individual case.
Deleviere County 10 Process	1.10 45060	C-h 0 44 1 1 1 1 2	N =	4 /2 /2 22	1131	\ \ \ 	V-	2/24/2022	A DEC
Delaware County, Indiana	1:18-op-45963	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		Yes	Yes	2/21/2023	A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Delaware County, Indiana	1:18-op-45963	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	•	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Delaware County, IN	1:18-op-45963	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018

									Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548). Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. **API - listed as no service of process . (Doc No. 4847)* **Dn April 14, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint. **Dn June 7, 2019, another email was forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Village of Herkimer, New York	1:18-op-45964	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Ves	In Process		 On June 10, 2019, another email was forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. On June 10, 2019, the email was acknowledged by Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq., saying said she would review and get back to us.
	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		44/45/2022		Yes	III Process		review and get back to us.
Jackson County, Missouri	1:18-op-45965	LLC Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
Jackson County, Missouri	1:18-op-45965	LLC	No	11/16/2022	Mylan	No			
									Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. **Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840) Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiff attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely. **Dn May 30, 2019, Masters was served at 3600 Pharma Way, Lebanon, Ohio 45036. The Affidavit of
									Service dated May 30, 2019 on file for Masters Pharma was filed on June 9, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45967 Doc No. 90).
City of Covington, KY	1:18-op-45967	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		•On February 13, 2023, emails were forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.
Meridian, MS	1:18-op-45969	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	10/8/2019	
	1:18-op-45974	·			Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Lower Sioux Community in	1:18-op-45976				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community	1:18-op-45977				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
		Levin Papantonio							
Cherokee County (NC)	1:18-op-45979	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/6/2019	
Brooks County, GA Brooks County, Georgia v.	1:18-op-45981	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp. Amneal	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Novartis Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal
Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45981	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Pharmaceuticalls; pending receipt of signed waiver
r drade i Harria, E.i, et al.	1.10 op 45501	Comey onggs rurem EE	163		T Harridecaticals EEC	1.63	III TOCCSS		That maceutically, perially receipt of signed water
Brooks County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45981	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
111-16-14		Kalla Balaka Luub	w		10.07 = 1		V	0 10 10 00 0	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
Island County, WA	1:18-op-45982	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	No	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
Island County Washington	1.19 on 4E092	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Voc		Hilma	Voc	Vos	3/20/2023	originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Island County, Washington	1:18-op-45982	Relief ROTHBACK L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Island County, Washington	1:18-op-45982	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Island County, Washington	1:18-op-45982	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Island County, Washington	1:18-op-45982	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Mylan	No			
Allamakee County, IA	1:18-op-45983	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Allamakee County, IA	1:18-OP-45983 (S.D. Io	, ,,	No	11/18/2022	Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	6/4/2019	
Andmakee county, 1A	1.10-01 -45565 (5.D. 10	Levin Papantonio	110	11/10/2022	Louisiana Wholesale	163	163	0/4/2013	
St. John the Baptist Parish	1:18-op-45987	Rafferty	Yes		Drug	Yes	Yes	2/2/2023	
	·	Levin Papantonio							
St. John the Baptist, LA	1:18-op-45987	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	02/23/2023	
		Levin Papantonio			_				
Walworth County, WI	1:18-op-45988	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech			3/25/2021	
		Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody &							
Essex County, NJ	1:18-op-45989	Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	2 Indivior	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
		Levin Papantonio				100			
Lenoir County (NC)	1:18-op-45991	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
The Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana	1:18-op-45996				Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642). incorrect case number - should be 18-45849 - responded to by Robbins Geller under correct case
County of Sonoma, California	1:18-op-45997				Mylan	Yes			number - should be 18-45849 - responded to by Robbins Geller under correct case
County of Softoma, California	1.18-0p-45997				Wyldn	TES			Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity — Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. — with the short form and operative complaint. <i>See</i> Dkt. No. 60. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff
		B.111 6.11. = .1							also served Mylan N.V.care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been
County of Tulare, California	1:19 on 45007	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Vac		Mylan	Vac	Vos	3/2/2023	on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
City of Garfield Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45997 1:18-op-45999	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan Hikma	Yes	Yes Yes	2/14/2023	issues related to mylan m.v. have been effectively tured.
,								, ,	
City of Garfield Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45999	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
		Levin Papantonio	ļ.,					. 10 10	
Town of Sheffield (MA)	1:18-op-46001	Rafferty	Yes		Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	4/8/2021	

									Counsel for Plainitff received the executed waiver of service from counsel for JM Smith
									Corporation (John J. Haggerty c/o Stephan A. Cornell; Fox Rothschild LLP) via email on April 10,
									2019. The executed waiver form was filed into the case docket on May 29, 2019 (1:18-op-460002;
									R. Doc. 9, at 4).
									PFS was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022.
		Neblett, Beard &							Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS
Town of Lake Providence (LA)	1:18-op-46002	Arsenault	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/10/2019	repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.
, ,								, ,, ,	
									Waiver of the Service of Summons for the County of Portage, Ohio, case no. 1:18-op-46006, was
									signed and returned by counsel James Hankle on behalf of Value Drug Co. on 4/10/2019 and filed
									on case docket as ECF 10 on 7/30/2019, which states on its face that, "If the waiver is signed and
County of Portage, Ohio, et al.									returned, [defendant] can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot
v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.	1:18-op-46006	Motley Rice	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/10/2019	object to the absence of a summons or service."
,,			1		10.00 1100			1, -2, -22	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
Kittitas County, WA	1:18-op-46008	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023.
medicas es anely, tox	1.12 op 1.000	Nemer Norm oder Erem i	1.00		NVIV TOOL			37 37 2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Kittitas County, Washington	1:18-op-46008	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
	2.10 Op 40000	Kener Normbuck L.L.F.	1.00				1.03	5, 20, 2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
I									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Whitman County Washington	1:19 on 46000	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Vos		Hilma	Voc	Voc	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Whitman County, Washington	1:18-0p-46009	Keller Konrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Walla Walla County,					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Washington	1:18-op-46010	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes			Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
wasiiiigtoii	1.16-0p-40010	Relief Rolli back L.L.F.	163		r Harmaceuticais EEC	163	163	3/14/2023	Arter multiple follow-ups, multion refused to sign waiver. Fersonal service perfected 3/10/2025.
Walla Walla County,					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Washington	1:18-op-46010	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
0								., ,	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
Walla Walla County,									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Washington	1:18-op-46010	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
	'								
City of North Olmsted, Ohio	1:18-op-46012	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of North Olmsted, Ohio	1:19 on 46012	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
· ·	1:18-op-46012 1:18-op-46013	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	•	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
	1:18-op-46013	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022		Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1:18-op-46014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	12/14/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/13/2023	
	1:18-op-46014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes			Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
.,,,					7 -			2/20/2020	
City of North Ridgeville (OH)	1:18-op-46015	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of North Ridgeville, Ohio	1:18-op-46015	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
_									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
City of Olympia, Washington	1:18-op-46021	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
	·								named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
City of Olympia, Washington Jefferson County, WA	1:18-op-46021 1:18-op-46023	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes Yes		Hikma KVK-Tech	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	3/20/2023 3/8/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
	·								named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
	·								named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
Jefferson County, WA	1:18-op-46023	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Jefferson County, WA Jefferson County, Washington	1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46023	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes Yes	42/20/2000	KVK-Tech Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
Jefferson County, WA Jefferson County, Washington	1:18-op-46023	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	12/28/2022	KVK-Tech Hikma Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Jefferson County, WA Jefferson County, Washington City of Laredo, Texas	1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46026	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Napoli Shkolnik	Yes Yes No		KVK-Tech Hikma Hikma Amneal	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	3/8/2023 3/20/2023 2/14/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Jefferson County, WA Jefferson County, Washington City of Laredo, Texas The City of Laredo, Texas	1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46026	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Napoli Shkolnik	Yes Yes No	12/28/2022	KVK-Tech Hikma Hikma Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	3/8/2023 3/20/2023 2/14/2023 2/22/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Jefferson County, WA Jefferson County, Washington City of Laredo, Texas The City of Laredo, Texas	1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46026	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik	Yes Yes No		KVK-Tech Hikma Hikma Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	3/8/2023 3/20/2023 2/14/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Jefferson County, WA Jefferson County, Washington City of Laredo, Texas The City of Laredo, Texas City of Laredo, Texas	1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46026 1:18-op-46026 1:18-op-46026	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik Simmons Hanly Conroy,	Yes Yes No No	12/28/2022 12/28/2022	KVK-Tech Hikma Hikma Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC Mylan	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	3/8/2023 3/20/2023 2/14/2023 2/22/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Jefferson County, WA Jefferson County, Washington City of Laredo, Texas The City of Laredo, Texas City of Laredo, Texas	1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46026	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes Yes No	12/28/2022	KVK-Tech Hikma Hikma Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	3/8/2023 3/20/2023 2/14/2023 2/22/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Jefferson County, WA Jefferson County, Washington City of Laredo, Texas The City of Laredo, Texas City of Laredo, Texas	1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46023 1:18-op-46026 1:18-op-46026 1:18-op-46026	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik Simmons Hanly Conroy,	Yes Yes No No	12/28/2022 12/28/2022	KVK-Tech Hikma Hikma Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC Mylan	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	3/8/2023 3/20/2023 2/14/2023 2/22/2023	named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.

Township of Painesville, Ohio	1:18-op-46035	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/202		Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Berlin County, NH	1:18-op-46040	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			
City of Berlin, New Hampshire	1:18-op-46040	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,								, , , , ,	
					Associated				
Northwest Arizona Employee					Pharmacies Inc/American				
Northwest Arizona Employee Benefit Trust	1:18-op-46043	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacie	s Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
Serience Trust	1.10 00 10013	Rener Horn back E.E.F.	103		7.550clated Filarifiaeic	3 103	165	2/2//2023	Watter med 2/21/25. Watter signed did received 4/5/2020.
					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
City of Kingman, Arizona	1:18-op-46057	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
City of Kingman, Arizona	1:18-op-46057	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
,					,	1		5, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
City of Kingman, Arizona	1:18-op-46057	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
					Inc/American				
City of Kingman, AZ	1:18-op-46057	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacie	s Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
't Chaulas Causatus Naisaassui	1.10 10050	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	NI -	11/16/2022	I I'll one o	l _{NI} -			
st. Charles County, Missouri	1:18-op-46059	LLC Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
it. Charles County, Missouri	1:18-op-46059	LLC	No	11/16/2022	Mylan	No			
·		Levin Papantonio							
Board of County Commissioners	s 1:18-op-46060	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
(1) Adams County, ID;									
(2) Blaine County, ID;									
(3) Boise County, ID;									
(4) Bonneville County, ID;									
5) Caribou County, ID;									
6) Cassia County, ID;									
7) Elmore County, ID; 8) Latah County, ID;					Associated				
(9) Minidoka County, ID;					Pharmacies				
(10) Owyhee County, ID; and		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Inc/American				
11) Payette County, ID	1:18-op-46062	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacie	s No			
ula de Caral de la Ing	1.40	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		44/40/2022	IO W. T. I				
Adams County et al., ID	1:18-op-46062	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech Louisiana Wholesale	No			
City of Shreveport, Louisiana	1:18-op-46064	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/202		No			
•	·	·							emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending
anier County (GA)	1:18-op-46066	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed waiver
					Associated				
					Associated Pharmacies	1			
					Inc/American				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Associated
anier County, GA	1:18-op-46066	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Associated Pharmacie	s Yes	In Process		Pharmacies; pending receipt of signed waiver
					Amneal				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal
anier County, Georgia	1:18-op-46066	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
anier County, Georgia	1:18-op-46066	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Vos		Mylan	Vos	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for Mylan Inc.; pending receipt of signed waiver
Lamer County, Georgia	1.10-Up-40U00	Levin Papantonio	162		Mylan	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed waiver
Madison County (NC)	1:18-op-46067	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
		Levin Papantonio							
ancey County (NC)	1:18-op-46071	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Scott County Board of	1:19 on 40074	Levin Papantonio	Voc		IM Smith	Vos	Vos	9/20/2010	
Supervisors (VA) Smyth County (VA)	1:18-op-46074 1:18-op-46077	Rafferty Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes Yes		JM Smith JM Smith	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	8/20/2019 7/16/2019	Executed Waiver of Service filed on 7/16/2019, and refiled on 2/21/2023.
, an county (va)	11.10 Oh-400//	Trabatan & cartinen	1.03	1	SATI STITLE	1.03	103	1,10,2013	

								The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states
afayette General Health		Neblett, Beard &		Louisiana Wholesal	e			that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a
•	1:18-op-46082	Arsenault	No	Drug	No			PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Opelousas General Hospital, a	4.40 45000	Neblett, Beard &		Louisiana Wholesal				The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a
ouisiana Public Trust	1:18-op-46083	Arsenault	No	Drug	No			PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Clanton, AL	1:18-op-46084	Levin Papantonio Rafferty Levin Papantonio	Yes	Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/2/2020	
own of Kingston, MA	1:18-op-46090	Rafferty	No	1/10/2023 KVK-Tech	No		N/A	Plaintiff's PFS was uploaded to the repository on 1/10/23.
<u> </u>	·							Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
City of Eureka, California, et al.	1:18-op-46092	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
The Fiscal Court of Wolfe County (KY)	1:18-op-46099	The Finnell Firm	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
	1:18-op-46106	Andrus Anderson LLP	No	12/11/2022 Hikma	No			Delay in submitting PFS to repository was inadvertent, has been cured, and is not prejudicial.
City of Rochester, New Hampshire, et al.	1:18-op-46106	Andrus Anderson LLP	No	12/11/2022 Amneal	No			Delay in submitting PFS to repository was inadvertent, has been cured, and is not prejudicial.
City of Rochester, New Hampshire, et al.	1:18-op-46106	Andrus Anderson LLP	No	12/11/2022 KVK-Tech	No			Delay in submitting PFS to repository was inadvertent, has been cured, and is not prejudicial.
City of Rochester, New Hampshire; Merrimack								
County, New Hampshire	1:18-op-46106	Andrus Anderson LLP	No	12/11/2022 Mylan	No			Delay in submitting PFS to repository was inadvertent, has been cured, and is not prejudicial.
Pulaski County, Indiana	1:18-op-46110	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023 Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/26/2018
ulaski County, Indiana	1:18-op-46110	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023 Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/26/2018
ulaski County, Indiana	1:18-op-46110	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023 Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/26/2018
ulaski County, IN	1:18-op-46110	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023 Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/26/2018
City of Strongsville, Ohio	1:18-op-46111	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Strongsville, Ohio	1:18-op-46111	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
		Brown, Readdick, Bumgartner, Carter,		2 (22 (222) 11 (2) 11				
Glynn County (GA)	1:18-op-46115	Strickland & Watkins, LL Brown, Readdick, Bumgartner, Carter,	PINO	2/20/2023 JM Smith	No			Glynn County's PFS was originally emailed on 1/14/19 to Liaison Counsel.

	•								
		Brown, Readdick,							encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." See MDL 2804 ECF No. 232, at 10 (italics supplied). On March 21, 2019, counsel for Glynn County, Georgia mailed the following to Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s registered agent: Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons; Waiver of the Service of Summons (2 copies); Short Form Complaint; and a Self-addressed stamped envelope. On February 19, 2023, counsel for Glynn County, Georgia emailed counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., identifying the above-referenced materials that were previously transmitted and requested the signed waiver. On March 3, 2023, counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., responded, "We are in receipt of your email requesting that Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., waive service of an amended complaint that was filed on March 18, 2019. The request for waiver is untimely, as this case was filed nearly four years ago. Setting that issue aside, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., is an improperly named holding company, and it has not manufactured, promoted, distributed, supplied, or sold any opioid-containing products. As noted in your email, Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC has already waived service in this case. Accordingly, we request that you dismiss Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. from this case. Please let us know if you would like to discuss this issue further." On March 21, 2023, counsel for Glynn County, Georgia replied, "Thank you for your response. In your email, you write, "We are in receipt of your email requesting that Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., waive service of an amended complaint that was filed on March 18, 2019. The request for waiver is untimely, as this case was filed nearly four years ago.' The Short Form Complaint adding Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.): Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons; Waiver of the Service of
		Bumgartner, Carter,			Amneal				Summons (2 copies); Short Form Complaint; a self-addressed stamped envelope; and a cover letter
Glynn County, Georgia	1:18-op-46115	Strickland & Watkins, LL	PNO	2/20/20	23 Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		from me. Thus, I would respectfully submit that the request for a waiver was timely. Further, I
Glynn County, GA Borough of Ridgefield, New	1:18-op-46115	Brown, Readdick, Bumgartner, Carter, Strickland & Watkins, LL	P No	2/20/20.	23 Indivior	No			Glynn County's PFS was originally emailed on 1/14/19 to Liaison Counsel.
Jersey	1:18-op-46117	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Borough of Ridgefield, New	1.10 Op 40117	Trapon Sinconin	103		Wylan	103	103	2/13/2023	
Jersey	1:18-op-46117	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
					Amneal				
Levy County, Florida	1:18-op-46119	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Levy County, Florida	1:18-op-46119	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Letcher County Fiscal Court		Levin Papantonio							
(KY)	1:18-op-46124	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
Town of Clendenin, WV	1:18-op-46127	Motley Rice	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		Curative service and waiver sent to Defense counsel's new Masters signatory.
TOWN OF CICHUCINII, WV	1.10-Up-4012/	iviolity nice	163		rnarmaceutical	163	111 F100855		Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
Chelan County, WA	1:18-op-46139	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Chelan County, Washington	1:18-op-46139	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
					Amnest				A waiver of service request was sent to defense counsel originally on 6/7/2019, but we did not receive the signed waiver, even though Defendant returned similar waivers. A renewed waiver of service has been emailed to Defense counsel but Defendant would not agree to waive service. We perfected service via process server on 2/28/2023 and filed proof of service in the individual case.
City of Portland, Indiana	1:18-op-46140	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/201	Amneal 23 Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023	PFS's originally served on 01/10/2019
or, or rordana, maiana	1.10 Op 40140	Concil & Maidu, LLi	1.10	1/3/20	LO I Harmaceuticais LLC	103	163	2,20,2023	1.000 ongridity served on our 10/2010
	1:18-op-46140	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/20	23 Hikma	No			PFS's originally served on 01/10/2019
City of Portland, Indiana; Jay									
County, Indiana	1:18-op-46140	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/20	23 Mylan	No			PFS's originally served on 01/10/2019
City of Portland and Jay	1:18-on 46140	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/2/20	23 Indivior	No			DES's originally served on 01/10/2019
County, IN	1:18-op-46140	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		1/3/20	23 mulvioi	INU			PFS's originally served on 01/10/2019
Robeson County (NC)	1:18-op-46141	LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
	•	•	•		•	•	L	<u> </u>	

		T			T	1		ı	
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Inc/American				
Robeson County, NC	1:18-op-46141	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies	No			
Fiscal Court of Montgomery		Levin Papantonio							
County (KY)	1:18-op-46144	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
Schuyler County, IL v. Purdue	op	Levin Papantonio			Pharmacy Buying				
	1:18-op-46147	Rafferty	Yes		Association	Yes	Yes	8/28/2019	
rilailia Er et ai	1.16-0p-40147	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	163		Association	163	163	0/20/2019	
		Levin Papantonio	v		10.4.6			0/05/0040	D. C. de de conseille des las DEC. des la
County of Johnson, IL	1:18-op-46148	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith			8/26/2019	Defendant error alleging late PFS upload.
									The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states
Hospital Service District No. 1		Neblett, Beard &			Louisiana Wholesale				that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a
of the Parish of LaSalle	1:18-op-46150	Arsenault	No		Drug	No			PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Ripley County, Indiana	1:18-op-46155	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/15/2019
Ripley County, Indiana	1:18-op-46155	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	B Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/15/2019
	1:18-op-46155	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/15/2019
	1:18-op-46155	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 01/15/2019
mpicy county, iiv	1.10-0p-40133	CONCIT & IVIdida, LLI	110	1/3/2023	Individi	140			ATTS was originally served on oi/15/2015
		[PFS was sent to Liaison Counsel on or before 10/14/22. However, Liaison Counsel contracted
		Levin Papantonio							Plaintiff's Counsel on 12/9/2022 and indicated that a Defense Counsel paralegal could not locate
Town of Upton, MA	1:18-op-46160	Rafferty	No	12/9/2023	KVK-Tech	No		N/A	the PFS. On 12/9/22, the PFS was re-transmitted to Liason Counsel and uploaded to the repository
									Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to John Haggerty, Fox Rothschild, on 5/28/2019 and
Tazewell County (VA)	1:18-op-46167	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		on 2/22/2023.
									Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to Michael P. Jurgens, 5820 Westown Parkway,
									West Des Moines, IA 50266 on 6/14/2019, and to Cameron Grant, Scharnhorst, Ast Kennard
Livingston County MO	1.10 OD 46160 (W.D.	Magataff & Cartmall	Ves		Uhr Maa	Vos	In Dragons		
Livingston County, MO	1:18-OP-46168 (W.D. I	wagstarr & Cartmen	Yes		Hy-Vee	Yes	In Process		Griffin, PC. on 2/17/2023.
									Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a
									different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548).
									Also and an architectural below and business of the second faith, and additional Maissance
									Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct
									any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no
									prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case
									Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are
									encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good
									cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has
									not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the
									Waivers be signed at the present time.
									API - listed as no service of process . (Doc. No. 4847)
									●Øn April 6, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the
									Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal
									Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.
									•On May 28, 2019, an email was re-forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of
									Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals,
									Inc.
									•On May 31, 2019, a further email was sent to Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq. regarding our request for
									Waivers.
									•Dn June 9, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal
									Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case Doc 1:18-op-
City of Syracuse, New York v.		Brindisi, Murad &			Amneal				46169 Doc Nos. 79 and 80).
Purdue Pharma, L.P.	1:18-op-46169	Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		
		Levin Papantonio							
Lee County (GA)	1:18-op-46171	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
			. 30			. 55	1.55	5, 2, 2525	
					Associated				
			į.	ı	Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
Lee County, GA	1:18-op-46171	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes			Yes	Yes	3/15/2021	
Lee County, GA	1:18-op-46171	· ·	Yes		Inc/American	Yes	Yes	3/15/2021	

	T				_	1	_	1	,
Board of Commissioners for Lucas County, Ohio; Mental Health and Recovery Services Board of Lucas County, Ohio; Lucas County Children Services Board of Trustees, Ohio Board of Commissioners of Lucas County (OH) Board of Commissioners of	1:18-op-46177 1:18-op-46177	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No No	11/16/2022 11/16/2022	Mylan Prescription Supply	No No			
Lucas County, Ohio, et al.	1:18-op-46177	LLC	No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
Lucas County Children Services Board of Trustees (OH) Mental Health & Recovery Services Board of Lucas County	1:18-op-46177	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/16/2022	Prescription Supply	No			
(OH)	1:18-op-46177	LLC	No	11/16/2022	Prescription Supply	No			
County of Ingham, MI	1:18-op-46178	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters 2 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes		In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Ingham, Michigan	1:18-op-46178	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	2 Mylan	No			
City of Franklin, Indiana et al.	1:18-op-46182	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			PFS's were originally served on 1/24/2019
City of Franklin, Indiana, et al.	1:18-op-46182	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	3 Amneal	No			PFS's were originally served on 1/24/2019
City of Franklin, Indiana; Town of Pendleton, Indiana; City of Richmond, Indiana	1:18-op-46182	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	3 Mylan	No			PFS's were originally served on 1/24/2019
City of Franklin, IN, et al.	1:18-op-46182	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
City of Franklin, Town of Pendleton, and City of				1-10					
Richmond, IN	1:18-op-46182	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			PFS's were originally served on 1/24/2019
Asha Causty (NC)	4:40 46405	Levin Papantonio	V		INA Conside	V	V	0/15/2010	
Ashe County (NC)	1:18-op-46185	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	8/15/2019	

April Control Contro		T								
Control of Prince 1 Cont										
150 1.5.2 157.2										representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be
Masser Service of service of service of service of services of s										186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service
Assertic County, Michigan 118-op-46187 Well z & Luceritary No 127/2027 Pharmacountical Yes Yes \$72/2019 planetime Yes Yes \$72/2019 planetime Yes Yes \$72/2019 planetime Yes Yes										Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was
County of Reways, Alichigan 118 op 44197 Vest & Livenburg No. 117//2007 (which is not control to the county of the						Masters				indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
Lawrence County, Indiana	County of Newaygo, MI	1:18-op-46187	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	plaintiffs.
Lawrence County, Indiana 118-op-6188	County of Newsygo Michigan	1.10 05 46107	Moits 9 Luyanhara	Ne	12/1/2022	Mulan	No			
Defendant did not list an alleged service defect in its recent filing. However, a review of their repealed that no valeer of service was pilled. A washer of service was pilled, a valeer of service was pilled, a valeer of service was pilled. A washer of service was pilled and pilled to defense counted on pilled to defense counted to defense counted on pilled to defense counted t	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· '				A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019
Teturned similar wavers. A renewed valver of service was process server on 2/37 and filled proof of service in the individual case. A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019										Defendant did not list an alleged service defect in its recent filing. However, a review of the docket revealed that no waiver of service was filed. A waiver of service request was sent to defense
Lawrence County, Indiana Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 Armeal Yes Yes 2/28/2023 A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Lawrence County, Indiana Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 linkma No A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Lawrence County, Indiana Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 linkma No A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Lawrence County, IN Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 linkma No A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Lawrence County, IN Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 linkma No A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Lawrence County, IN Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 linkma No A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Lawrence County, IN Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 linkma No A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Lawrence County, IN Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 linkma No A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Lawrence County, IN Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 linkma No A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Lawrence County, IN Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 linkma No A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Lawrence County, IN Lit-Brop-6138 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/1/2023 linkma No No NA PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023. Dark County, Missouri Lit-Brop-6138 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Mylan No NA PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Mylan No NA PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Amneal No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Sandor/Novaris No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Sandor/Novaris No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Sandor/Novaris No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Sandor/Novaris No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Sandor/Novaris No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Sandor/Novaris No A PFS was o										returned similar waivers. A renewed waiver of service was emailed to Defense counsel but Defendant would not agree to waive service. We perfected service via process server on 2/28/2023
Lawrence County, Indiana 138-op-46188 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 Mylan No APS was originally served on 01/24/2019										·
Lawrence County, Indiana 138-op-46188 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 Mylan No APFS was originally served on 01/24/2019		•						Yes	2/28/2023	
Lawrence County, IN 118-op-46188 Cohen & Malad, LIP No 1/3/2023 Indivior No										
Cole County, MO 1:18-0p-46189	•	•				•	_			
Reynolds County, MO v. Purdue Pharma LP et al 1:18-op-46:198 Rafferty Yes Association Yes Yes Yes 4/15/2021	Lawrence country, in	1.10 00 10100	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	110	1/3/2023	marvior	110			ATTO Was ongmany served on our English
Purdue Pharmar LP et al 1:18-op-46193 Rafferty Yes Association Yes Yes 4/15/2021	Cole County, MO	1:18-op-46189	Rafferty	Yes		Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023	
Levin Papartonio Czark County (MO) 1:18-op-46198 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Hikma No N/A PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023.	1		-							
Dzark County (MO) 1:18-op-46198 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Hikma No N/A PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023. Levin Papantonio Levin Papantonio Levin Papantonio Levin Papantonio 1/11/2023 M Smith Yes Yes 3/26/2021 PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023. PFS Uploaded	Purdue Pharma LP et al	1:18-op-46193		Yes		Association	Yes	Yes	4/15/2021	
Levin Papantonio Coark County (MO) 1:18-op-46198 Rafferty No No 1/11/2023 JM Smith Yes Yes 3/26/2021 PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023.	Ozark County (MO)	1:18-op-46198	-	No	1/11/2023	Hikma	No		N/A	PES Unloaded on 1/11/2023.
Cozark County, Missouri 1:18-op-46198 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Mylan No N/A PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023.		op 10-00			3, 24, 24, 24				.,,,,,	,
Ozark County, Missouri 1:18-op-46198 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Mylan No N/A PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023.	Ozark County (MO)	1:18-op-46198		No	1/11/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/26/2021	PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023.
Dzark County, MO v. Purdue Pharma I.P et al 1:18-op-46198 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Association Yes Yes 4/15/2021	Ozark County Misses	1:10 on 40100	•	No	4 /44 /2022	Mulan	No		N1 / A	DES Unloaded on 1/11/2022
Pharma LP et al 1:18-op-46198 Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Association Yes Yes 4/15/2021	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.10-0h-40139	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	INU	1/11/2023		INU		IN/A	ΓΓ3 Ομισαμέα ΟΠ 1/11/2023.
Levin Papantonio Levin Papantonio Rafferty No 1/11/2023 Amneal No N/A		1:18-op-46198		No	1/11/2023		Yes	Yes	4/15/2021	
Benton Country, IN 1:18-op-46201 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Sandoz/Novartis No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Benton Country, Indiana 1:18-op-46201 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Amneal No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Benton Country, Indiana 1:18-op-46201 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Hikma No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Benton Country, IN 1:18-op-46201 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Indivior No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Levin Papantonio Rafferty Yes JM Smith Yes Yes 9/10/2019 St. Tammany Parish Government, LA 1:18-op-46211 Leger & Shaw Yes Indivior Yes Yes 3/15/2023 Service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023. Levin Papantonio No 1/3/2023 Indivior Yes Yes 3/15/2023 Service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.										
Benton County, Indiana 1:18-op-46201 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Amneal No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Benton County, Indiana 1:18-op-46201 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Hikma No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Benton County, IN 1:18-op-46201 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Indivior No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Levin Papantonio Rafferty Yes JM Smith Yes Yes 9/10/2019 St. Tammany Parish Government, LA 1:18-op-46211 Leger & Shaw Yes Indivior Yes Yes 3/15/2023 Service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.		•							N/A	A DEC
Benton County, Indiana 1:18-op-46201 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Hikma No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Benton County, IN 1:18-op-46201 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Indivior No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Levin Papantonio Alexander County (NC) 1:18-op-46205 Rafferty Yes JM Smith Yes Yes 9/10/2019 St. Tammany Parish Government, LA 1:18-op-46211 Leger & Shaw Yes Indivior Yes Yes 3/15/2023 service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023. Levin Papantonio										
Benton County, IN 1:18-op-46201 Cohen & Malad, LLP No 1/3/2023 Indivior No A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019 Levin Papantonio Alexander County (NC) 1:18-op-46205 Rafferty Yes JM Smith Yes Yes 9/10/2019 St. Tammany Parish Government, LA 1:18-op-46211 Leger & Shaw Yes Indivior Yes Yes 3/15/2023 Service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023. Levin Papantonio										
Alexander County (NC) 1:18-op-46205 Rafferty Yes JM Smith Yes Yes 9/10/2019 St. Tammany Parish Government, LA 1:18-op-46211 Leger & Shaw Yes Indivior Yes Yes 3/15/2023 Service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023. Levin Papantonio			Cohen & Malad, LLP							
St. Tammany Parish Government, LA 1:18-op-46211 Leger & Shaw Yes Indivior Yes Yes 3/15/2023 Evin Papantonio Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agreements agreement agreement. Service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023. Evin Papantonio										
Government, LA 1:18-op-46211 Leger & Shaw Yes Indivior Yes Yes 3/15/2023 service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023. Levin Papantonio	Alexander County (NC)	1:18-op-46205	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
Levin Papantonio Levin Papantonio	•	1:18-op-46211		Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
District Township Department 1440 on 46245 Deffects			Levin Papantonio							
Plains Township, Pennsylvania v 1:18-op-46215 Rafferty Yes Value Drug Yes Yes 2/7/2023	Plains Township, Pennsylvania v	1:18-op-46215	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/7/2023	

						1			
		Levin Papantonio							
Leon County, FL	1:18-op-46242	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
		Levin Papantonio							
Tallahassee, FL	1:18-op-46243	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
		Levin Papantonio							
Ripley County (MO)	1:18-op-46262	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	4/1/2021	
		Bahe Cook Cantley &							
Green County Fiscal Court,		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn							
1	1:18-op-46272	Law	No	1/10/2023	3 Hikma	No			
,				, ,					
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Inc/American				
Canuan Caunty ID	1.10 on 40377		No	11/10/2022		l _{No}			
Canyon County, ID	1:18-op-46277	LLC Circurate Hands Commercial	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies	NO			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		44 /40 /0000		1			
Canyon County, ID	1:18-op-46277	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
									Waiver of the Service of Summons for the Town of Gauley Bridge, WV was signed and returned by
									counsel Allen Lopus on behalf of Top Rx, LLC on 12/14/2018, which states on its face that, "If the
									waiver is signed and returned, [defendant] can still make these and all other defenses and
Town of Gauley Bridge, WV	1:18-OP-46278	Motley Rice	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	12/14/2018	objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or service."
								, , , , ,	
Randy Smith, duly elected									
Sheriff of St. Tammany Parish,									
Louisiana, in his capacity as									
' '									
Officer Ex Officio of the St.									
Tammany Parish Sheriff's									
Office and the St. Tammany									
Parish Law Enforcement									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
District, LA	1:18-op-46280	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
		Levin Papantonio							
Union County (GA)	1:18-op-46284	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
,		·			Masters				
City of Boise, ID	1:18-op-46289	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/202	3 Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
,									
									Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and
									Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan
									Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 74. CMO 1
									· · ·
									suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service,
									Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff
									also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has
County of San Luis Obispo,		Robbins Geller Rudman							been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural
California	1:18-op-46290	& Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
									Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
San Juan County, WA	1:18-op-46291	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023.
·									
					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
San Juan County, Washington	1:18-op-46291	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
			1.5-			1	1.00	57 = 17 = 5 = 5	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Can Ivan Caunty Washington	1.10 on 40201	Kallar Dahrhaak I I D	Vas		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Vos	Vos	2/14/2022	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
San Juan County, Washington	1:18-op-46291	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Priarmaceuticais, inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
San Juan County, Washington	1:18-op-46291	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
Pohlmann, Sheriff of St.					Inc/American				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
1	1:18-op-46292	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023. (Doc. No. 33)
Pohlmann, Sheriff of St.	1.10 Op-40232	Leger & Jilaw		+	. issociated i flatfilacies		103	3/ 14/ 2023	35. 1.55 or process made of 11/2025. Executed neturn of service filed of 14/2025. (Doc. NO. 55)
									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Pornard									
Bernard Parish Louisiana	1:18-OP-46292	Leger & Shaw	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.

	1				1		1	
James Pohlmann, duly elected								
Sheriff of St. Bernard Parish,								
Louisiana, in his capacity as								
Officer Ex Officio of the St.								
Bernard Parish Sheriff's Office								
and the St. Bernard Parish Law								Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Enforcement District, LA	1:18-op-46292	Leger & Shaw	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Rockdale County, Georgia	1:18-op-46296	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
				Louisiana Wholesale				
City of Bogalusa, Louisiana	1:18-op-46297	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Drug	Yes	Yes	2/9/2023	
				Amneal				
City of Bogalusa, Louisiana	1:18-op-46297	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Bogalusa, Louisiana	1:18-op-46297	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Clayton County, Georgia	1:18-op-46298	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022 Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Warrensville Heights,								
Ohio	1:18-op-46299	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022 Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Coos County, Oregon	1:18-op-46300	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Lewis County, WA	1:18-op-46301	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	KVK-Tech	No			
Lewis County, Washington	1:18-op-46301	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/28/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of McClain								
County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46303	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022 Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
The Board of County								
Commissioners of McClain								
County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46303	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022 Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Garvin								
County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46304	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/30/2022 Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Garvin								
County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46304	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/30/2022 Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
		Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,						
		Olstein, Brody &						
Camden County, NJ	1:18-op-46306	Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022 Indivior	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
		Levin Papantonio						
City of Hickory (NC)	1:18-op-46307	Rafferty	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
City of Atlanta, Georgia	1:18-op-46308	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022 Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
The City of Atlanta (GA)	1:18-op-46308	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022 JM Smith	No			
Henry County, Georgia	1:18-op-46310	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022 Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	
Henry County, Georgia	1:18-op-46310	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022 Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Portland, a municipality					1			
in Cumberland County, ME	1:18-op-46313	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	KVK-Tech	No			
City of Portland, Maine	1:18-op-46313	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Portland, Maine	1:18-op-46313	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Bangor, Maine	1:18-op-46314	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hikma	No			
				Amneal				
City of Bangor, Maine	1:18-op-46314	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Bangor, Maine	1:18-op-46314	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Lewiston, a municipality								
in Androscoggin County, State				Amneal				
of Maine	1:18-op-46315	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Lewiston, Maine	1:18-op-46315	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Lewiston, Maine	1:18-op-46315	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
		Levin Papantonio						
Washington County (TN)	1:18-op-46317	Rafferty	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	1/20/2021	
		•	•			•	-	

Ladford 1310-9-6-1219 MCCarthy, LLP Rough State 1310-9-6-1219 Report 101-9-1219 Repo										
Company of Sunday Comp	County of San Mateo, California	1:18-op-46319	· ·	No	2/3/2023	Hikma	No			Despite trying to monitor the voluminous docket in the MDL we missed the Order to re-submit the PFS. Once we realized the mistake we immediately corrected it. The Spangenberg database reflects upload of the PFS "February 3" with no year, we assume 2023. In other complex cases Liasion Counsel keeps non-leadership firms apprised of deadlines, that does not appear to have happened in October 2022, which would have been helpful. It was only on 2/17/23 that clear instructions were provided. Spangenberg has not provided a copy of the brief they plan to file as of 2/20/2023,
Read of County Control County Control County Coun	County of San Mateo,		· ·							Despite trying to monitor the voluminous docket in the MDL we missed the Order to re-submit the PFS. Once we realized the mistake we immediately corrected it. The Spangenberg database reflects upload of the PFS "February 3" with no year, we assume 2023. In other complex cases Liasion Counsel keeps non-leadership firms apprised of deadlines, that does not appear to have happened in October 2022, which would have been helpful. It was only on 2/17/23 that clear instructions were provided. Spangenberg has not provided a copy of the brief they plan to file as of 2/20/2023,
Communicacies of Foundation 2,100 of 48,270 Repost Abletion 10 of 12,718/2002 Release 12,7		1:18-op-46319	McCarthy, LLP	No	2/3/2023	Mylan	No			despite request.
Table Tabl										
The Search of County Control County (Control (Co		1:18-op-46320	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/10/2023	
Source 158-04-9321 Nagel Shoulks No. 12/13/2022 Euringeon Drug Per Per Nagel Shoulks Nagel	The Board of County	1.10 op 40320	тары эткоптк	110	12/13/2022	Tilkina	163	163	2/10/2023	
Page	Commissioners of Delaware									
Commissioner of Delevier County (Commissioner of Delevier County (Collegan County Commissioner of Delevier County (Collegan County Collegan	County (OK)	1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	3/9/2023	
Commissioner of Delevier County (Commissioner of Delevier County (Collegan County Commissioner of Delevier County (Collegan County Collegan										
Search County C	•									
Source of County Commissioners of Delaware County, Chishnoria 138 op 46321 Vagoli Shidnik No		1·18-on-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Commissioners of Delaware County Chathorna 138 op-46321 Napoli Sholnik No 12/13/2022 Nylan Yes Yes 2/13/2023 Napoli Sholnik No 12/13/2022 Nylan Yes Yes 2/13/2023 Napoli Sholnik No 12/13/2022 Nylan Yes Yes 2/13/2023 Nylan Napoli Sholnik No 12/13/2022 Nylan Yes Yes 2/13/2023 Nylan Napoli Sholnik No 12/13/2022 Nylan N	country, chianoma	1110 00 10021	Trapen emiceniii		12/10/2022			1.00	2, 10, 2020	
Doard of County Dalayare Da	•									
Doard of County Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Obtioners of Delaware County, Obtainers of Ob										
Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Okthown, or 18-0-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/7022 No. 12/13/	County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Okthown, or 18-0-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/7022 No. 12/13/	Board of County									
The Board of County Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Oklahoma 118-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceutcals LLC Ves Ves 2/22/2023 Naporal Shkolnik No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceutcals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/22/2023 Naporal Shkolnik No No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceutcals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/22/2023 Naporal Shkolnik No No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceutcals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/22/2023 Naporal Shkolnik No	•									
Commissioners of Delaware County, Cathor of Oddshoma 1:8-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes Ves 2/22/2023 valver also sent 2/17/23 valver also sent 2/17/23 The Baard of County Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Oddshoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/22/2023 valver also sent 2/17/23 The Baard of County Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Oddshoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/22/2023 valver also sent 2/17/23 Commissioners of Otsage County, Oddshoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 13/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/14/2023 valver also sent 2/17/23 County, Oddshoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik Ves Pes Pes 2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/14/2023 Valver also sent 2/17/23 County, Oddshoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik Ves Pes Pes 2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves 2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Pes 2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves 2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves 2/14/	County, State of Oklahoma, OK	1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Commissioners of Delaware County, Cathor of Oxidahoma 1:8-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceuticals LLC Ves Ves 2/22/2023 valver also sent 2/17/23 The Baard of County Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Oxidahoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/22/2023 valver also sent 2/17/23 The Baard of County Counts of Oxidate of Oxidahoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/22/2023 valver also sent 2/17/23 County, Oxidahoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/14/2023 County, Oxidahoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik Ves Pes Pes 2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/14/2023 County, Oxidahoma 1:18-op-46322 Napoli Shkolnik Ves Pes Pes 2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/14/2023 County, Oxidahoma 1:18-op-46323 Napoli Shkolnik Ves Pes Pes 2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Ves 2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves										
County, State of Oklahoma 138-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes Yes 2/22/2023 waiver also sent 2/17/23 waiver also sent 2/17/23	•					Amneal				
The Board of County County, State of Oklahoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes Yes 2/22/2023 waiver also sent 2/17/23 waiver also sent 2/17/23 waiver also sent 2/17/23 waiver also sent 2/17/23 Waiver also sent 2/17/23		1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022		Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Oklahoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Yes 2/22/2023 waiver also sent 2/17/23 waiver also sent 2/17/203 waive								1.00		
County, Chahoma 1:18-op-46321 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/13/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes Yes 2/22/2023 waiver also sent 2/17/23 waiver also sent 2/17	The Board of County									
Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma 1.18-op-46322 Napoli Shkolnik No 1/3/2023 Hikma Yes Yes 2/14/2023					40/40/0000			.,	0 /00 /000	
Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma 1:18-op-46322 Napoli Shkolnik No 1/3/2023 Hikma Yes Yes 2/14/2023 Roard of County Commissioners of Ottawa County, Oklahoma 1:18-op-46323 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Yes 2/14/2023 The Board of County Commissioners of Ottawa County, Oklahoma 1:18-op-46323 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Napoli Shkolnik Yes Yes 2/14/2023 Roard of County Commissioners of Ottawa County, Oklahoma 1:18-op-46323 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Yes 2/13/2023 Ropelowitz Ostrow Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert; Robbins Geller City of Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 1:18-op-46329 Rudman & Dowd Ltp Yes Hikma No Painty Ft. Souther Repository. Davidson County (NC) 1:18-op-46320 LtC No 11/18/2022 MM Smith No Painty Ft. Souther Repository. Simmons Hanly Conroy, Simmons Hanly		1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/1//23
County Oklahoma 1:18-op-46322 Napoli Shkolnik No 1/3/2023 Hikma Ves Ves 2/14/2023	Commissioners of Osage									
Commissioners of Ottawa County, Oklahoma 1:18-op-46323 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Hikma Yes Yes 2/14/2023 2/14/20		1:18-op-46322	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
County, Oklahoma 1:18-op-46323 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Hikma Yes Yes 2/14/2023 The Board of County Commissioners of Ottawa County, Oklahoma 1:18-op-46323 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Mylan Yes Yes 2/13/2023 Kopelowitz Ostrow Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert; Robbins Geller City of Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 1:18-op-46329 Rudman & Dowd LLP Yes Hikma No Plaintiff timely sent its PFS to the repository. Davidson County (NC) 1:18-op-46330 LLC No 11/18/2022 JM Smith No Plaintiff timely sent its PFS to the repository. Associated Pharmacies Inc/American										
The Board of County Commissioners of Ottawa County, Oklahoma 1:18-op-46323 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Mylan Yes Yes 2/13/2023 Kopelowitz Ostrow Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert; Robbins Geller Gilbert, Robbins Geller August Strow Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert, Robbins Geller Strow Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert, Robbins Geller August Milkma No Plaintiff timely sent its PFS to the repository. Davidson County (NC) 1:18-op-46320 LLC No 11/18/2022 JM Smith No Plaintiff timely sent its PFS to the repository. Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Inc/American Inc/American				.,				.,		
County, Oklahoma 1:18-op-46323 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Mylan Yes Yes 2/13/2023 Kopelowitz Ostrow Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert; Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP Paintiff timely sent its PFS to the repository. Davidson County (NC) 1:18-op-46330 LLC No 11/18/2022 JM Smith No Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Inc/American		1:18-op-46323	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		нікта	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
County, Oklahoma 1:18-op-46323 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Mylan Yes Yes 2/13/2023 Molecular County (NC) 1:18-op-46329 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Mylan Yes Yes Yes 2/13/2023 Molecular County (NC) 1:18-op-46329 Rudman & Dowd LLP Yes Hikma No Plaintiff timely sent its PFS to the repository. No 11/18/2022 JM Smith No Plaintiff timely sent its PFS to the repository. Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Simmons Hanly Conroy, Simmons H	- I									
Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert; Robbins Geller Robbins		1:18-op-46323	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert; Robbins Geller Robbins										
Gilbert; Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP Yes Hikma No Plaintiff timely sent its PFS to the repository. Davidson County (NC) 1:18-op-46330 1:18-op-4633			· ·							
City of Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 1:18-op-46329 Rudman & Dowd LLP Yes										
Davidson County (NC) 1:18-op-46330 Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC No 11/18/2022 JM Smith Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Simmons Hanly Conroy,	City of Ft. Lauderdale, Florida	1:18-op-46329		Yes		Hikma	No			Plaintiff timely sent its PFS to the repository.
Associated Pharmacies Inc/American		,								
Pharmacies Simmons Hanly Conroy, Inc/American	Davidson County (NC)	1:18-op-46330	LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
Pharmacies Simmons Hanly Conroy, Inc/American						Associated				
Simmons Hanly Conroy, Inc/American										
			Simmons Hanly Conroy							
	Davidson County, NC	1:18-op-46330		No	11/18/2022	'	No			

					1				
		Levin Papantonio							
Bradenton, FL	1:18-op-46331	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/2/2020	
Commissioners of St. Mary's		Levin Papantonio							
County (MD)	1:18-op-46334	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
		Levin Papantonio							
City of Albany (GA)	1:18-op-46337	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/6/2021	
		Levin Papantonio			Amneal				
City of Albany, Georgia	1:18-op-46337	Rafferty	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	
, ,,	·	Levin Papantonio						, ,	
Albany, GA	1:18-op-46337	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
7.1.20.177 6.7.	2.10 op 1000?	name cy			TTIME STATE	1.00		0, 2, 2020	emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending
Grady County (GA)	1:18-op-46338	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Voc		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed waiver
Grady County (GA)	1.16-0p-40336	Conney Griggs Fai till EEF	163		JIVI SITIICII	163	III F TOCESS		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to Mylan Inc; pending receipt of
Crady County Coordin	1.10 on 40220	Canlay Criggs Dortin LLD	Voc		Mulan	Vas	In Process		signed waiver
Grady County, Georgia	1:18-op-46338	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	res		Mylan Amneal	Yes	In Process		ů
Grady County, Georgia v.			.,						emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending
Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-46338	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed waiver
Grady County, Georgia v.					Amneal				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal
Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-46338	Conley Griggs Partin LLP			Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Findlay, Ohio	1:18-op-46339	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Forest County Potawatomi Community	1:18-op-46342				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Roosevelt County, New Mexico	1:18-op-46343	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
The County of Roosevelt, New					Amneal				
Mexico	1:18-op-46343	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
		·			,			, , , , , ,	
Roosevelt County, New Mexico	1:18-op-46343	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Mental Health & Recovery	2.20 op 100 io	, repending			,	1		2, 23, 2023	
Services Board of Allen,									
Auglaize, and Hardin Counties,		Spangenberg Shibley &							As owner of the repository, we were the first to submit our clients PFSs. Due to a technical glitch,
Ohio	1:18-op-46344	Liber	No	1/28/2023	Amnoal	No			this PFS was not transferred into the new repository.
Ollo	1:18-0p-46344	Libei	INU	1/20/2023	Allilledi	INO			this PF3 was not transferred into the new repository.
City of Kenova, WV	1:18-OP-46346	Motley Rice	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	1/4/2019	Waiver of the Service of Summons for the City of Kenova, WV was signed and returned by counsel Allen Lopus on behalf of Top Rx, LLC on 12/14/2018, which states on its face that, "If the waiver is signed and returned, [defendant] can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or service."
		Levin Papantonio	. = 3		10.00	1.00	1.55	2, ., 2013	y and a supplied to the described of a summerior of services
Webster County (MO)	1:18-op-46350	Rafferty	No	1/31/2023	IM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/1/2021	
Webster County (IVIO)	1.10-0p-40330		INO	1/31/2023	JIVI JIIIILII	162	162	4/1/2021	
Mobster County Missey	1:19 on 46350	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	1/31/2023	Amnoal	No		NI/A	
Webster County, Missouri	1:18-op-46350		INU	1/31/2023		No		N/A	
Webster County, MO v.		Levin Papantonio			Pharmacy Buying	<u> </u>	.,		
Purdue Pharma LP et al	1:18-op-46350	Rafferty	No	1/31/2023	Association	Yes	Yes	4/15/2021	
Hillsborough County, New						1			
Hampshire	1:18-op-46353	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	

City of Utica, New York v. Purdue Pharma, L.P. Johnson County, MO v. Purdue Pharma, L.P. et al	1:18-op-46359 1:19-op-45363-DAP	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	In Process	12/3/2019	Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548). Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ₱6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847) ■On April 1, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint. ■On April 24, another email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq. requesting him to sign and return the Waivers. ■On May 19, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:18-op-46359 Doc Nos. 68 and 69). ■On May 28, 2019, a follow up email was sent to Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint. Pharmacy Buying Association states in their submission to the Court that service was effective in 2019.
County of Kent, MI	1:19-op-45000	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of New Orleans, Louisiana	·	Leger & Shaw	Yes	, , ,	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/14/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
	·								Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
City of New Orleans, Louisiana	±.±5-0p-45003	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023. Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
City of New Orleans, LA	1:19-op-45003	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.

Section of Section o	<u></u>		T			1	1	T	1	
The Control of Contr	Gary Gilley, Duly Elected									
Price of the First of the Price of the Pri										
Part College Part										
Secretary Law 150 - 4000										
March Marc										
A										
Page		1:19-op-45007		No	1/3/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
The College Service College Se										
See of Continue Market See of Continue Mar		1:19-op-45007	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
See Season of Miles Review 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1										
Price of the Score February Control (Control										
Section Control Cont										
Milester Developer Devel										
Separation Sep										
Prince 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 1		1:19-op-45007		No	1/3/2023		No			
Table Control Contro										
Part Continues 179 of 45077 U.C. 160 17/2/2013 sandour 180		1:19-op-45007		No	1/3/2023	Drug	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
Substitution 19-p-1007 CC 17-20-20 Indication 19-p-1007 CC 17-20-20 Indication 19-p-1007 CC 19-p-1007]			.			
		1:19-op-45007		No	1/3/2023	iviylan	No			
The PEC Access the platefile is a train and was improperly derefied by Dofendate on its service and fact sheet its The Court's 1/1/25 Order (MARS) was directed to "plantiff submissions" only in addition, the 1/1/11/16 Acides Implementation of Order (Mark) was placed to Coverment and State Institute only and did not apply to plantiff submissions of the 1/1/16 Order, Ackay. Divy of New Roads, Louisians 119-op-5011 Westback to The Particular Submission of the 1/1/16 Order, Ackay. Divy of New Roads, Louisians 119-op-5011 Westback to Cover (Mark) and the Cover of Cover (Mark) and the Cover of					. /- /	0 1 /0				
Increase	Parish), LA	1:19-op-45007	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
No.										The DEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was impreparity identified by Defendant on its semilar and
Number N										
Supervision Pharma L.P., et al. 219-op-45010 Supervision Supervision No Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, 8642).	North our Chavener Triba NAT									
Called New Roads, Louisians 119-op-45011 Warhauer, LIC No 1/38/2023 Mylan No		1:10 on 45010				Cum an /alu	No			
David, New Boads, Louisiana 119-op-45011 Variabure, 11C No 1/30/2023 Nylan No	v. Purdue Priarrila L.P., et al.	1.19-0p-45010				Supervalu	INO			Etitities offly and did flot apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
David, New Boads, Louisiana 119-op-45011 Variabure, 11C No 1/30/2023 Nylan No			Gainsburgh Boniamin							
No										
City of New Roads, Louisiana 1:9-op-45011	City of New Roads Louisiana	1·10-on-45011		No	1/30/2023	Hikma	No			
David, Mecunier & David, Mecun	City of New Roads, Edulatina	1.13 Op 43011	Warshader, EEC	NO	1/30/2023	TIIKITU	NO			
David, Mecunier & David, Mecun			Gainsburgh, Benjamin							
Direct New Roads, Louisiana 19-op-45011 Varshauer, LC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No										
Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Winn-Dixie No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Winn-Dixie No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Inlikma No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Inlikma No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Sainsburgh, Benjamin, Devick, Meunier & Warshauer, LL No Sainsburgh, Benja	City of New Roads, Louisiana	1:19-op-45011		No	1/30/2023	Mylan	No			
David, Meunier & Varishuer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Anneal No Sew Roads, Louisiana 1:19-op-45011 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Winn-Dixide No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45011 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Winn-Dixide No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45011 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45011 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45011 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No No Sew Roads, LA 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No No Sew			,		, ,	, -				
David, Meunier & Usafshuer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Anneal No Sander, LLC No 1/30/2023 Anneal No Sander, LLC No 1/30/2023 Minn-Dixide No Sander, LLC No 1/30/2023 Minn-Dixide No Sander, LLC No 1/30/2023 Minn-Dixide No Sander, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Sander, LLC No 1/30/202			Gainsburgh, Benjamin,							
No 1/30/2023 Amneal No No No No No No No N										
Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Winn-Dixie No City of New Roads, LA 1:19-op-45011 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Indivior No No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Indivior No	City of New Roads, Louisiana	1:19-op-45011		No	1/30/2023	Amneal	No			
David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Winn-Dikie No Cainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Cainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Cainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Cainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunie		•								
New Roads, LA 119-op-45011 Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 119-op-45011 No 119-op-45011 No 119-op-45011 No 119-op-45011 No 119-op-45011 No 119-op-45011 No 119-op-45012 No 130/2023 Amneal No No No No No No No No No N			Gainsburgh, Benjamin,							
Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Solitic Jury of the Parish of Point Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Solitic Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Solitic Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Solitic Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No Solitic Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No Soli			David, Meunier &							
David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Police Jury of the Parish of Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Police Jury of the Parish of Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Police Jury of the Parish of Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Police Jury of the Parish of Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Police Jury of the Parish of Polinte Farish of Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Polinte Farish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Polinte David, Meunier & David & David, Meunier & David & Da	New Roads, LA	1:19-op-45011	Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Winn-Dixie	No			
David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Police Jury of the Parish of Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Police Jury of the Parish of Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Police Jury of the Parish of Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Police Jury of the Parish of Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Police Jury of the Parish of Polinte Farish of Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Polinte Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Polinte Farish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Polinte David, Meunier & David & David, Meunier & David & Da					·					
City of New Roads, LA 1:19-op-45011 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Indivior No Rolice Jury of the Parish of Politice Jury										
Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Mylan No Solitice Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Solitice Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Solitice Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitice Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitice Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Solitice Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & David, Meu										
Police Jury of the Parish of Point Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 David, Meunier & No	City of New Roads, LA	1:19-op-45011	Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Indivior	No			
Police Jury of the Parish of Point Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Mylan No										
Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & Police Jury of the Parish of David,										
Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Police Jury of the Parish of Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & No										
Police Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & David,	Point Coupee, Louisiana	1:19-op-45012	Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Mylan	No			
Police Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier & David,										
Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Hikma No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No										
Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No David, Meunier & Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & David, Meu	1									
Police Jury of the Parish of Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier &	Pointe Coupee, Louisiana	1:19-op-45012	Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Hikma	No			
Police Jury of the Parish of Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier &										
Pointe Coupee, Louisiana 1:19-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC No 1/30/2023 Amneal No Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & David, Meunier & Gainsburgh Senjamin, Gainsburgh Se										
Gainsburgh, Benjamin, Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier &				<u> </u>], ,	l			
Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier &	Pointe Coupee, Louisiana	1:19-op-45012	Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Amneal	No			
Police Jury of the Parish of David, Meunier &			Cainahanah Bariari							
	Dolico luny of the Dorich of									
Formulae Coupled, LA 1.13-op-45012 Warshauer, LLC INO 1/30/2025 Individit INO		1:10 on 4E012		No	1/20/2022	Indivior	No			
	Fornte Coupee, LA	1.13-0h-42017	vvaisilauei, LLC	INU	1/30/2023	Indiviol	INO		<u> </u>	

		Gainsburgh, Benjamin,						
Policy Jury of the Parish of		David, Meunier &						
Pointe Coupee, LA	1:19-op-45012	Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023 Winn-Dixie	No			
City of Saint Martinville,		Levin Papantonio		Louisiana Wholesale				
Louisiana	1:19-op-45013	Rafferty	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	2/2/2023	
		Levin Papantonio						
Saint Martinville, LA	1:19-op-45013	Rafferty	Yes	Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	2/2/2023	
		Levin Papantonio						
Haywood County (NC)	1:19-op-45014	Rafferty	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	8/15/2019	
								Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
County of Maricopa, Arizona	1:19-op-45020	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
								Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
				Louisiana Wholesale				service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023. (Waiver of Service
Ascension Parish Government	1:19-op-45027	Leger & Shaw	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	executed in October 2022 filed 2-13-2022.)
Access to Build Comment								
Ascension Parish Government,								Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Louisiana	1:19-op-45027	Leger & Shaw	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
la								
Ascension Parish Government,								Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Louisiana	1:19-op-45027	Leger & Shaw	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/14/2022	service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Ascension Parish Government,		0 . 61 .	W	1. 19.4.			0 /4 = /0 000	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
LA	1:19-op-45027	Leger & Shaw	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
City of Daniel describe								
City of Donaldsonville,	45020	0 61	W	LIST			2/44/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Louisiana	1:19-op-45028	Leger & Shaw	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/14/2022	service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
City of Donaldsonville,			.,	Louisiana Wholesale		.,	0 /40 /0000	Waiver of service executed in October 2022. Filed executed waiver of service into record
Louisiana	1:19-op-45028	Leger & Shaw	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	2/13/2023. Defendant removed from Amended Notice.
City of Develder wills								
City of Donaldsonville,	1.10 45020	Lagar Q Chave	Vos	Mulan	Vos	Ves	2/16/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Louisiana	1:19-op-45028	Leger & Shaw	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
								Descend Corvice of chart form amonded complaint with state court notition on registered agent for
City of Donaldsonville, LA	1:19-op-45028	Leger & Shaw	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
City of Anacortes and Sedro-					1.55		0,10,101	
Woolley School District,				Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Washington	1:19-op-45029	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of Anacortes and Sedro-	1.13 OF 13023	Rener Rombdek E.E.I :	163	That maceuticals EEC	103	163	3/11/2023	Atter manage rands ups, marrier related to sign waver. I elsonal service perfected of 10/2025.
Woolley School District,				Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Washington	1:19-op-45029	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Trasimi gran	2.23 op .5025	Nemer Normback Elem 1		r na massatisatis, mar	1.00	1.00	3/11/2020	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
								named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
City of Anacortes, Washington								originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
et al.	1:19-op-45029	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Fitchburg,	1.13 OP 43023	Neiler Norm back Erem			1.00	1.00	3/20/2023	, around service per ested of 25/25-25
Massachusetts	1:19-op-45030	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Fitchburg,	2.13 OF 43030		1.33	TIMIN	1.55	1.65	2/ 17/ 2023	
Massachusetts	1:19-op-45030	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
TVIUSSUCITUS CEES	1.15 ор 45050	Trapell Stikelink	163	ivi yidii	103	163	2/13/2023	
								Service waivers were sent to Amneal lead counsel Paul Cosgrove per his request on April 26, 2019.
								He agreed to waive service on behalf of his client. Believing Amneal's position on service to be in
								error, we re-sent service waivers as Cosgrove had requested back in 2019. Cosgrove's associate
				Amneal				responded to advise they would not waive service as they had agreed to do. We believe service has
Sweetwater County, Wyoming	1:19-on-45031	Schwartz Bon		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	4/26/2019	been effected on Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC in accordance with federal rules.
Jethater county, wyoming	15 OF 15051	Levin Papantonio		i na maccaticais EEC		100	1, 20, 2013	255. Shoted on mined in all independently acommunic with reducin fully.
County of McKinley, NM	1:19-op-45033	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	7/19/2021	
Country of Wickiniey, Wivi	1.13 OF 43033	numercy		IVIV TCOII	103	103	7/13/2021	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
								named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
İ								originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
City of Thornton, Colorado	1:19-op-45034	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
one, or information, colorado	1.10 OP-40034	Mener Moniback L.L.F.	100	HIKHIG		103	3/20/2023	. 0.00.1at 3ct vice per rected 3/ 13/ 2023.

1				1	1	1	1	T	
Decad of County									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
Board of County									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
Commissioners of the County			.,			.,		0 /00 /000	originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
-	1:19-op-45035	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Board of County									
Commissioners of the County						.,		- /- /	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
of Adams, CO	1:19-op-45036	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023.
15 1 60 1									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
Board of County									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
Commissioners of the County			.,			.,			originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
	1:19-op-45036	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
The Board of County									D 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Commissioners of the County	4.40 45026	Kalla a Bala da adala da B	W		Amneal		w.	2/44/2022	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
·	1:19-op-45036	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
The Board of County									
Commissioners of the County			.,		Amneal	.,			Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
of Adams, Colorado 1:	1:19-op-45036	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
		Levin Papantonio							
Bartow County (GA) 1:	1:19-op-45045	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
		Levin Papantonio							
Polk County (GA) 1:	1:19-op-45046	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	8/29/2019	
,									
,					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
Kentucky River District Health					Inc/American				
Department 1:	1:19-op-45050	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Rio Arriba County, New Mexico 1:	1:19-op-45054	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
		Levin Papantonio							
Town of Scituate, MA 1:	1:19-op-45063	Rafferty	Yes		Ahold Delhaize	Yes	Yes	5/8/2020	
		Levin Papantonio			American Sales				
	1:19-op-45063	Rafferty	Yes			Yes	Yes	5/8/2020	
County of Brevard, Florida 1:	1:19-op-45064	LCHB	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 3/14/2023. No response. Praecipe to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
									Waiver sent 3/14/2023. Defendants replied that they will not waive service. Praecipe to obtain
County of Brevard, Florida 1:	1:19-op-45064	LCHB	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		summons filed on 3/20/2023.
					Masters				
City of Preston, ID 1	1:19-op-45067	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
County of Douglas, Nebraska 1:	1:19-op-45068	LLC	No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
,,	1:19-OP-45068 (D. Neb	LLC	No	11/16/2022	Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	6/2/2019	
	1:19-op-45074	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 05/15/2019
	•	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 05/15/2019
		Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023		No			A PFS was originally served on 05/15/2019
Morgan County, Tennessee 1:	1:19-op-45075	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Mylan	No			
Τ		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on
Casper, Wyoming 1:	1:19-op-45079	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
,					Associated				
,					Pharmacies				
,		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
County of Greenbrier, WV 1:	1:19-op-45080	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	7/24/2019	
		Levin Papantonio							
City of Nanticoke, Pennsylvania 1	1:19-op-45081	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/16/2020	
,									
City of Great Falls, Counties of		Simon Greenstone							
City of Great Falls, Counties of Anaconda-Deer Lodge, and		Simon di eenstone		i .	I .	la.			
Anaconda-Deer Lodge, and		Panatier, P.C.	Yes	10/21/2022	Indivior	INO			
Anaconda-Deer Lodge, and Lake, and City of Missoula, MT 1:	1:19-op-45083		Yes	10/21/2022	Indivior	No			
Anaconda-Deer Lodge, and Lake, and City of Missoula, MT 1. City of Great Falls, et al.,	1:19-op-45083	Panatier, P.C. Simon Greenstone	Yes						
Anaconda-Deer Lodge, and Lake, and City of Missoula, MT 1. City of Great Falls, et al., Montana 1.	1:19-op-45083 1:19-op-45083	Panatier, P.C. Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.		10/21/2022		No			
Anaconda-Deer Lodge, and Lake, and City of Missoula, MT City of Great Falls, et al., Montana Lity of Great Falls, Montana, et	1:19-op-45083 1:19-op-45083	Panatier, P.C. Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C. Simon Greenstone	No	10/21/2022	Hikma	No			
Anaconda-Deer Lodge, and Lake, and City of Missoula, MT City of Great Falls, et al., Montana Lity of Great Falls, Montana, et	1:19-op-45083 1:19-op-45083	Panatier, P.C. Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.			Hikma				

İ	I	Marc J. Bern & Partners,	1	1		ı	1		
Noble County, Ohio	1:19-op-45096	LLP	No	3/21/2023	2 Mylan	No			
Noble County, Onlo	1:19-0p-45096	Skikos Crawford Skikos	INO	3/21/2023	Siviyiari	INO			
									A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on
Lincoln County, Nebraska	1:19-op-45099	& Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Pleasant		OCIIS LAW TITTI	163	Not required; Dkt.	iviyiaii	163	INO	IN/A	2/17/23. The request was defined by Mylan.
	1:19-op-45100	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	638, Dkt. 643	Zydus	Yes	No		
rome	1.15-0p-45100	Weitz & Luxelibeig	NO	030, DKI. 043	Zydus	163	INO		
					Associated				API/AAP's own status report indicates that waiver was unreasonably withheld. It indicates that the
					Pharmacies				waiver was received by API/AAP, but that it was more than 90 days after API/AAP was named.
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Pleasant				Not required; Dkt.	Inc/American				Given the complete lack of prejudice since API/AAP was stayed, it is unreasonable to refuse to
' '	1:19-op-45100	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	638. Dkt. 651	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	No		waive service.
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Pleasant	•	Weitz & Editerioers	110	Not required; Dkt.	7 ISSOCIATED THAT MACIES	103	110		Warve Service.
Point	1:19-op-45100	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	638, Dkt. 648	Apotex	No			
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Pleasant		Weitz & Editerioers	110	030, DKt. 040	просел	110			
Point, ME v. Purdue Pharma				Not required; Dkt.					
, ·	1:19-op-45100	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	638, Dkt. 646	SuperValu	No			
	1:19-op-45108	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022		Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
,	1:19-op-45108	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	<u> </u>	No		2/10/2020	
	2.25 op .5200		1	==/==/					Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Missoula County, Montana	1:19-op-45112	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
iviissedia eediity, ivioitedia	1.15 OP 45112	Rener Hom back Elem :	163		Tilliana	103	163	3/20/2023	Waiver filed 3/3/23. Dakota Drug added on short form. No waiver filed on the docket by Dakota
Missoula County, MT	1:19-op-45112	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	3/3/2023	Drug per CTO 1. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. Waiver returned 3/3/23.
	1:19-op-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	3 JM Smith	Yes	In Process	3/3/2023	Request for waiver of service sent; no response.
Trainison county (1415)	1.15 op 45115	Truzer r ze	110	1,10,2025	Sivi Sillien	103	1111100033		request of waver of service sent, no response.
Harrison County, Mississippi	1:19-op-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	R Hikma	No			
Trainison county, wiississippi	1.15 op 45115	Truzer r ze	110	1,10,2025	Tilking	110			
Harrison County, Mississippi	1:19-op-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	Nylan	No			
That is seen equity, it is said supp.	1.15 OP 45115		1.10	2/ 20/ 2020	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
Harrison County, Mississippi	1:19-op-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	R Amneal	No			
	1:19-op-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023		No			
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe	1:19-op-45114				Dakota Drug	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
County of Mohave, Arizona	1:19-op-45117	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
1									
	_				Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Mohave County, Arizona	1:19-op-45117	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Mohave County, Arizona	1:19-op-45117	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
					Associated Pharmacies Inc/American				
Mohave County, AZ	1:19-op-45117	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
									emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending
Atkinson County (GA)	1:19-op-45118	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		reciept of signed Waiver
Atkinson County, GA	1:19-op-45118	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Associated Pharmacies; pending receipt of signed Waiver
						[_		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for Mylan Inc.; pending
Atkinson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45118	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed Waiver
					Amneal				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal
Atkinson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45118	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Pharmaceuticals LLC; pending receipt of signed Waiver
		Levin Papantonio			l	[
Town of Dennis (MA)	1:19-op-45124	Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/14/2019	

1	1		_	i i	1	ı		
		Levin Papantonio						
Town of Provincetown (MA)	1:19-op-45125	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/5/2019	
County of San Mateo,		Cotchett, Pitre &						The County of San Mateo previously produced a timely PFS, which we understand was destroyed. Despite trying to monitor the voluminous docket in the MDL we missed the Order to re-submit the PFS. Once we realized the mistake we immediately corrected it. The Spangenberg database reflects upload of the PFS "February 3" with no year, we assume 2023. In other complex cases Liasion Counsel keeps non-leadership firms apprised of deadlines, that does not appear to have happened in October 2022, which would have been helpful. It was only on 2/17/23 that clear instructions were provided. Spangenberg has not provided a copy of the brief they plan to file as of 2/20/2023,
California	1:19-op-45126	McCarthy, LLP	No	2/3/2023 Hikma	No			despite request.
County of San Mateo, California	1:19-op-45126	Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	No	2/3/2023 Mylan	No			The County of San Mateo previously produced a timely PFS, which we understand was destroyed. Despite trying to monitor the voluminous docket in the MDL we missed the Order to re-submit the PFS. Once we realized the mistake we immediately corrected it. The Spangenberg database reflects upload of the PFS "February 3" with no year, we assume 2023. In other complex cases Liasion Counsel keeps non-leadership firms apprised of deadlines, that does not appear to have happened in October 2022, which would have been helpful. It was only on 2/17/23 that clear instructions were provided. Spangenberg has not provided a copy of the brief they plan to file as of 2/20/2023, despite request.
	·							Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
								named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
County of Santa Barbara,	1.10 45120	Kallan Dahmhaali I I D	V	luster-	V	V	2/20/2022	originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
California et al.	1:19-op-45128	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Friedman, Dazzio &	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Damascus (GA)	1:19-op-45129	Zulanas, P.C.	No	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		
		Friedman, Dazzio &						PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
City of Arlington (GA) Cities of Blakely, Arlington, and	1:19-op-45129	Zulanas, P.C. Friedman, Dazzio &	No	3/3/2023 JM Smith	Yes	In Process		before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Damascus, Georgia	1:19-op-45129	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
		Friedman, Dazzio &						
City of Blakely (GA)	1:19-op-45129	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		
		Friedman, Dazzio &						
City of Blakely, Georgia, et al. The City of Blakely, Georgia, et	1:19-op-45129	Zulanas, P.C. Friedman, Dazzio &	Yes	Hikma Amneal	Yes	In Process		
al	1:19-op-45129	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
/	1.15 00 .5115	Friedman, Dazzio &	1.00					
The City of Blakely, GA	1:19-op-45129-DAP	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
		Friedman, Dazzio &						
Heard County, Georgia	1:19-op-45130	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	Hikma	No			
Discours (TNI)		Friedman, Dazzio &		10.00				
Blount County (TN)	1:19-op-45132	Zulanas, P.C. Friedman, Dazzio &	Yes	JM Smith Amneal	Yes	In Process		
Blount County, Tennessee, et al.	1:19-op-45132	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
	1.13 00 43132	Zalanas) i rei	1.00		1.00			
Blount County, Tennessee;		Friedman, Dazzio &						
Jefferson County, Tennessee	1:19-op-45132	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
		Friedman, Dazzio &			.,			
Jefferson County (TN)	1:19-op-45132	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		
Blount County and Jefferson County, TN	1:19-op-45132	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
obality, 114	Ob -0102		1.03	Intuivior	1.03	1111100033		

1	ı	Í	İ	1		1	İ	
City of Rainsville, Alabama et al	1:19-op-45135	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Rainsville, Alabama; Town of Hammondville, Alabama	1:19-op-45135	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Rainsville, AL and Town of Hammondville, AL	1:19-op-45135	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Red Bay, Alabama et al	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Red Bay, Alabama; City of Russellville, Alabama, Sheffield, Alabama; and Leighton, Alabama	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

1	1	1	ı	1	ı	ı	
City of Russellville (AL)	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No 3/3/20	23 JM Smith	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Sheffield (AL)	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No 3/3/20	23 JM Smith	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
The City of Red Bay (AL)	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No 3/3/20	23 JM Smith	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Leighton (AL)	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No 3/3/20	23 JM Smith	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Cities of Red Bay, Russellville, and Sheffield, AL, and Town of Leighton, AL	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No 3/3/20	23 Indivior	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

Iberville Parish								
Council, LA	1:19-op-45140	Pendley, Baudin & Co	ffin No	2/22/2023 Michael Babich	Yes	No		Defendant has been dismissed
City of Vestavia Hills, Alabama	1:19-op-45141	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023 Hikma	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Vestavia Hills, Alabama	1:19-op-45141	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023 Mylan	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Vestavia Hills, AL	1:19-op-45141	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023 Indivior	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Doyle T. Wooten, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Coffee County (GA) Doyle T. Wooten, Sheriff of	1:19-op-45145	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.
Coffee County, Georgia Lewis S. Walker in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of	1:19-op-45145	LCНВ	No	2/20/2023 Mylan	No			
Crawford County, Georgia	1:19-op-45146	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 Amneal	No			
Lewis S. Walker, Sheriff of Crawford County, GA	1:19-op-45146	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Walker (Sheriff of Crawford	·						3/3/2013	Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent
County), GA Lewis S. Walker, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of	1:19-op-45146	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		3/17/2023). Praecipe to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Crawford County (GA)	1:19-op-45146	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 JM Smith	No			
Jolley (Sheriff of Harris County), GA Mike Jolley in his official	1:19-op-45147	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent 3/17/2023). Praecipe to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Capacity as the Sheriff of				0/6-/				
Harris County (GA)	1:19-op-45147	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.

Mike Jolley in his official									
Capacity as the Sheriff of									
Harris County, Georgia	1:19-op-45147	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
E. Neal Jump, in his official									
Capacity as the Sheriff of Glynn									
County (GA)	1:19-op-45155	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.
E. Neal Jump in his official									
Capacity as the Sheriff of Glynn									
	1:19-op-45155	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
E. Neal Jump, Sheriff of Glynn	,								
	1:19-op-45155	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Bohannon (Sheriff of Jeff Davis					7.2	1.12			Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent
County), GA	1:19-op-45161	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		3/17/2023). Praecipe to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
	1.13 Op 43101	20.15		2,20,2020	5411452 11161	1.03			5/17/2015/11 1806/pc to 03tam 5ammons med 611 6/12/20151
Preston Bohannon, in his									
official Capacity as the Sheriff									
	1:19-op-45161	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	IM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
of Jeff Davis County (GA)	1.19-0p-45161	LCTIB	INO	2/20/2023	JIVI SIIIILII	165	163	9/10/2019	Walver of Service filed off docket 2/23/2023.
Preston Bohannon, Sheriff of									
-	1:19-op-45161	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mulan	No			
Jeff Davis County, Georgia	1:19-0p-45161	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	iviyian	No			
D.N. ((Dutala)) D									
R.N. "Butch" Reece, in his									
Official Capacity as the Sheriff									
Of Jones County (GA)	1:19-op-45162	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Dean (Sheriff of Laurens									Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent
County), GA	1:19-op-45163	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		3/17/2023). Praecipe to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Larry H. Dean, in his official									
Capacity as the Sheriff of									
, , ,	1:19-op-45163	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Larry H. Dean, Sheriff of									
Laurens County, Georgia	1:19-op-45163	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Gary Langford, in his official									
Capacity as the Sheriff of									
Murray County (GA)	1:19-op-45164	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	No			
Gary Langford, Sheriff of									
Murray County, Georgia	1:19-op-45164	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Scott Berry, Sheriff of Oconee									
County, Georgia	1:19-op-45165	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Ramsey Bennett, in his official									
Capacity as the Sheriff of									
Pierce County (GA)	1:19-op-45166	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
, , ,	'			· · ·					
Ramsey Bennett in his official									
Capacity as the Sheriff of									
	1:19-op-45166	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
Kile (Sheriff of Screven	1.13 Op 43100	20.15	1	2,20,2020	7	1.10			Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent
County), GA	1:19-op-45167	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		3/17/2023). Praecipe to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Mike Kile in his official	1.13 Op-4310/	-5115		2,20,2023	Canada IIIC.	1.00			5/ 1./ 1.025/. 1 (decipe to obtain summons med on 5/21/2025.
Capacity as the Sheriff of									
	1:10 on 45167	LCHB	No	2/20/2022	Amnoal	No			
Screven County, Georgia Mike Kile, Sheriff of Screven	1:19-op-45167	LCTD	No	2/20/2023	Ailliedi	No			
	1.10 on 45167	LCUB	No	2/20/2022	Mulan	l _{No}			
	1:19-op-45167	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	iviyian	No			
Gene Scarbrough, in his official									
Capacity as the Sheriff of Tift				- la - la		<u> </u>	.,		
County (GA)	1:19-op-45168	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Gene Scarbrough in his official									
Capacity as the Sheriff of Tift									
	1:19-op-45168	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
Gene Scarbrough, Sheriff of									
Tift County, Georgia	1:19-op-45168	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			

Randy F. Royal, in his official								
Capacity as the Sheriff of Ware		LCHB	No	2/20/2023 JM Smith	Vos	Ves	9/16/2019	Majura of consider filed on decket 2/22/2022
County (GA) Randy F. Royal, Sherifff of	1:19-op-45169	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Ware County, Georgia	1:19-op-45169	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 Mylan	No			
Trail of Godiney, Good Bid	1.13 op .5103	20.13		2/20/2020 111/1011				
John G. Carter, in his official								
Capacity as the Sheriff of								
Wayne County (GA)	1:19-op-45170	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
John G. Carter, Sheriff of								
Wayne County, Georgia	1:19-op-45170	LCHB	No	2/20/2023 Mylan	No			
Million County (CA)	1.10 45171	Blasingame, Burch,	N	12/14/2022 INA Contib	V	V	F /C /2010	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Wilkes County (GA)	1:19-op-45171	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Wilkes County, Georgia	1:19-op-45171	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
wines county, deorgia	1.15-0p-45171	Blasingame, Burch,	140	12/14/2022 Wylan	IVO			
Wilkes County, Georgia	1:19-op-45171	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
,, ,		Blasingame, Burch,						
Wilkes County, Georgia	1:19-op-45171	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Towns County (GA)	1:19-op-45172	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Towns County, Georgia	1:19-op-45172	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,	l	10 /11 /0000				
Towns County, Georgia	1:19-op-45172	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
Towns County, Georgia	1:19-op-45172	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
Towns County, Georgia	1.19-0p-45172	Blasingame, Burch,	NO	12/14/2022	INO			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
McIntosh County (GA)	1:19-op-45173	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
, (, , ,	1.13 op .5175	Blasingame, Burch,			1.00		3,0,2013	
McIntosh County, Georgia	1:19-op-45173	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
	·	Blasingame, Burch,						
McIntosh County, Georgia	1:19-op-45173	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Cherokee County (GA)	1:19-op-45174	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 5/6/20
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Cherokee County, Georgia	1:19-op-45174	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Amneal	No			
Cherokee County, Georgia	1:19-op-45174	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Hikma	No			
Cherokee County, Georgia	1.19-0p-45174	Blasingame, Burch,	INO	12/15/2022 FIRITIO	INO			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Glascock County (GA)	1:19-op-45175	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
	op 10-10	Blasingame, Burch,			1.00		0,0,00	
Glascock County, Georgia	1:19-op-45175	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Glascock County, Georgia	1:19-op-45175	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Pulaski County (GA)	1:19-op-45176	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Dulaski Causty Con 1	1.10 0- 45476	Blasingame, Burch,	No	42/44/2022	N -			
Pulaski County, Georgia	1:19-op-45176	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
Pulaski County, Georgia	1:19-op-45176	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
i diaski county, dedigia	1.15-0p-451/0	Blasingame, Burch,	INO	12/14/2022 Allilledi	140			
Pulaski County, Georgia	1:19-op-45176	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,	-	,,				Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Rabun County (GA)	1:19-op-45177	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Rabun County, Georgia	1:19-op-45177	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Rabun County, Georgia	1:19-op-45177	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
F(C) - 1 C	4.40	Blasingame, Burch,		10 14 10000	,		F 10 100 : 5	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Effingham County (GA)	1:19-op-45178	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Effingham County Coarsia	1:10 05 45170	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 84:45	No			
Effingham County, Georgia	1:19-op-45178	Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
Effingham County, Georgia	1:19-op-45178	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
	1.13-0h-431/0	Garraia & Asilicy, F.C.	1140	12/14/2022 Allilleal	1110			

•		•		-		•			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Effingham County, Georgia	1:19-op-45178	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
511 0 1 (OA)		Blasingame, Burch,		40/44/0000				= /c/2242	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Pike County (GA)	1:19-op-45179	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Pike County, Georgia	1:19-op-45179	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amnoal	No			
rike County, Georgia	1.13-0p-43173	Blasingame, Burch,	INO	12/14/2022	Allilleal	NO			
Pike County, Georgia	1:19-op-45179	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,		//					Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Early County (GA)	1:19-op-45180	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Early County, Georgia	1:19-op-45180	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Early County, Georgia	1:19-op-45180	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
S	4.40 45404	Blasingame, Burch,		42/44/2022	IN A C III	W		5 /C /2040	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Seminole County (GA)	1:19-op-45181	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022	JIVI SMITH	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Seminole County, Georgia	1:19-op-45181	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Serimole County, Georgia	1.15-0p-45181	Blasingame, Burch,	NO	12/14/2022	Annear	NO			
Seminole County, Georgia	1:19-op-45181	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		Blasingame, Burch,		, , -		-			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Clay County (GA)	1:19-op-45194	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 5/13/20.
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Blasingame, Burch,			Inc/American				Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/20/19.
Clay County, GA	1:19-op-45194	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 5/13/20.
Clay County, Georgia	1:19-op-45194	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amnoal	No			
Clay County, Georgia	1.15-0p-45154	Blasingame, Burch,	NO	12/13/2022	Allilleal	110			
Clay County, Georgia	1:19-op-45194	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
, , ,	'	Blasingame, Burch,		, ,					Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Stephens County (GA)	1:19-op-45195	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,			Amneal				Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 10/4/19.
Stephens County, Georgia	1:19-op-45195	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	10/4/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Start and Country	4.40	Blasingame, Burch,		42/44/2022	Amneal	W		40/4/2040	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 10/4/19.
Stephens County, Georgia	1:19-op-45195	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	10/4/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Stephens County, Georgia	1:19-op-45195	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
stephens county, deorgia	1.13 OP 43133	Blasingame, Burch,	110	12/11/2022	THICHC	110			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Long County (GA)	1:19-op-45196		No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Long County, Georgia	1:19-op-45196	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Long County, Georgia	1:19-op-45196	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Clinch County (CA)	1:19-op-45197	Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/13/2022	IM Smith	Vos	Voc	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23.
Clinch County (GA)	1.12-0h-4213/	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	IVU	12/13/2022	ווווונן אווונן	Yes	Yes	3/0/2019	rianium meu une waiver with the Court On 2/1/25.
Clinch County, Georgia	1:19-op-45197	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
,,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		Blasingame, Burch,	1	12, 13, 2022	14 - 1 - 1 - 1				
Clinch County, Georgia	1:19-op-45197	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
_		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Screven County (GA)	1:19-op-45198	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Screven County, Georgia	1:19-op-45198	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Caravan Caunty: C	1.10 on 45100	Blasingame, Burch,	No	42/44/2022	Hilmo	No.			
Screven County, Georgia	1:19-op-45198	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022	пікта	No			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
City of Springfield (GA)	1:19-op-45199	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	IM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23
Titl or obringing (OA)		Blasingame, Burch,		12, 17, 2022	Amneal	1.20	1.55	-, -,	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 10/4/19.
City of Springfield, Georgia	1:19-op-45199	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	10/4/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
	,	,,			-				
		Blasingame, Burch,			Amneal				Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 10/4/19.
City of Springfield, Georgia	1:19-op-45199	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	10/4/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
									· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

		Blasingame, Burch,	1					
City of Springfield, Georgia	1:19-op-45199	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Liberty County (GA)	1:19-op-45200	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Liberty County Coords	1.10 on 45200	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hillion	No			
Liberty County, Georgia	1:19-op-45200	Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
Liberty County, Georgia	1:19-op-45200	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,		,,				Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Jefferson County (GA)	1:19-op-45201	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Jefferson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45201	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Jefferson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45201	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
Dandalah Causty (CA)	1:19-op-45202	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 INA Smith	Vos	Vac	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Randolph County (GA)	1:19-0p-45202	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintill filed the waiver with the court on 2/3/23.
				Associated				
				Pharmacies				
		Blasingame, Burch,		Inc/American				Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/20/19.
Randolph County, GA	1:19-op-45202	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
	·	Blasingame, Burch,						
Randolph County, Georgia	1:19-op-45202	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Randolph County, Georgia	1:19-op-45202	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Greene County (GA)	1:19-op-45203	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Carres County Consis	1.10 45202	Blasingame, Burch,	NI-	42/44/2022 Uillim -	NI -			
Greene County, Georgia	1:19-op-45203	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
Greene County, Georgia	1:19-op-45203	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
Greene county, Georgia	1.13 OF 43203	Blasingame, Burch,	110	12/14/2022 Wylun	110			
Greene County, Georgia	1:19-op-45203	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
1,7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Wayne County (GA)	1:19-op-45204	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Wayne County, Georgia	1:19-op-45204	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Wayne County, Georgia	1:19-op-45204	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
Burka County (CA)	1.10 on 45307	Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/13/2022 JM Smith	Vos	Vac	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 4/3/20.
Burke County (GA)	1:19-op-45207	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/13/2022 Jivi Simith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the court of 4/3/20.
Burke County, Georgia	1:19-op-45207	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Hikma	No			
Durite country, coorgia	1.13 op .520;	Blasingame, Burch,	1.10	22,20,2022 11111113	1.10			
Burke County, Georgia	1:19-op-45207	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Spalding County (GA)	1:19-op-45208	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
				Associated				
		Disability of the Control of the Con		Pharmacies				Defendant sixual and astronauth and a 2/20/40
Spalding County CA	1:10 05 45300	Blasingame, Burch,	No.	Inc/American	Voc	Vas	0/20/2040	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/20/19.
Spalding County, GA	1:19-op-45208	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022 Associated Pharmacies	res	Yes	9/20/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Spalding County, Georgia	1:19-op-45208	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
Sparania County, Georgia	1.13 Op 43200	Blasingame, Burch,	140	12/17/2022 HINHIG	140			
Spalding County, Georgia	1:19-op-45208	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Emanuel County (GA)	1:19-op-45209	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,						
Emanuel County, Georgia	1:19-op-45209	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,	1		1			
Emanuel County, Georgia	1:19-op-45209	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
Emanuel County Coordin	1:10 on 45300	Blasingame, Burch,	No.	12/14/2022 Ammod	No			
Emanuel County, Georgia	1:19-op-45209	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Dawson County (GA)	1:19-op-45210	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23.
Danison County (GA)	1.13 OF 43210	Carrara & Asincy, 1.C.	1.10	12/ 1 1/ 2022 JIVI JIIIICII	1100	1.03	3/ 0/ 2013	

1	1	late to the second	i i		İ	İ	Í		
Davis Carretic Carreia	1.10 45310	Blasingame, Burch,	N =	42/44/2022	I I'lline -	N-			
Dawson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45210	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	нікта	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,		40/44/0000					
Dawson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45210	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Lumpkin County (GA)	1:19-op-45211	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Lumpkin County, Georgia	1:19-op-45211	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Lumpkin County, Georgia	1:19-op-45211	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
									Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548). Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847) *In June 5, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint. *In June 5, 2019, the email was acknowledged by Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq., saying she would review and get back to our law firm. *In June 7, 2019, Waivers were returned for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC only.
									•Dn June 9, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:19-op-45214
									Doc No. 59 and 60).
City of Geneva, New York v.		Brindisi, Murad &			Amneal				
•	1:19-op-45214	Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		•Øn February 10, 2023, an email was re-forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver
	1:19-op-45217	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
County of Havajo, Alizona	1.13-0p-4321/	Rener Norm Dack L.L.F.	163		rinking	1.03	103	3/20/2023	To a solution perfected by 15/2025.
					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Navaia County Arizona	1:10 on 45217	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Voc			Voc	Voc	3/14/2023	
Navajo County, Arizona	1:19-op-45217	Keller KUTIFDACK L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
					A				Delegation of Compiler and an arrange of the La (4.4/20, 14.4)
					Amneal	L .	.,	0/4.4/5	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Navajo County, Arizona	1:19-op-45217	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
		O'Leary, Shelton,							
		Corrigan, Peterson,							Emailed waiver request to Defendant on 2/13/23 but no reply was received from Defendant;
City of Memphis, Tennessee	1:19-op-45220	Dalton & Quillin, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/20/2023	accordingly, Alias Summons served on 2/20/23
		O'Leary, Shelton,							
		Corrigan, Peterson,							
City of Memphis, Tennessee	1:19-op-45220	Dalton & Quillin, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Mylan	No			
									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
City of Lakewood, Washington	1:19-op-45221	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
		Marc J. Bern & Partners,							
Meigs County, Ohio	1:19-op-45229	LLP	No	3/21/2023	Mylan	No			
		Marc J. Bern & Partners,							
Washington County, Ohio	1:19-op-45230	LLP	No	3/21/2023	1	No	i	1	

	1	T	1					
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, i cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of ser if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effetenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, sub sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreemed did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effect business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant of time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according remement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has be	including those ce would be rivice, except that ective as of the adivision counsel ment. Defendant ctive the tenth claims for the first ing to the parties'
							served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Fur abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service	· ·
							the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of serv	vice form. After
							Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with D again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this country is the service of th	
							clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unne	
							associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] g	
				Amneal			to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return execut	
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Pharmaceuticals of			service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon rece	
Montgomery County, Virginia	1:19-op-45234	LLP	Yes	New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	Defendant.	
		Sanford Hairlar Sharp		Ampool			On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, it cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of serif defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effectenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subsent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreemed did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effect business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant of time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has be served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Fur abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service perfendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with D again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unner associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] go to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return execut	including those the would be tryice, except that fective as of the polivision counsel ment. Defendant ctive the tenth claims for the first ing to the parties' peen properly rther, out of an the on along with vice form. After Defendant and burt has made excessary expenses grant[ed] requests to 1 6c, ECF No. ted waivers of
	4.40 45224	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes		service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon rece	ipt from
Montgomery County, Virginia						In Process	Defendant.	1

	T	Ţ	1	1	1	
						On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
						cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
						effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
						if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
						tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint,
						subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties'
						agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was
						effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served
						according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that
						Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect
						service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver
						of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver
						of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up
						with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this
						court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid
						unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should
						have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
						Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to
Giles County, Virginia v.	1.10 45326	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Amneal	V	la Danasa	return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly
Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45236	LLP Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	upon receipt from Defendant.
						On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that
						Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
						cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
						effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
						if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
						tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel
						sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant
						did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth
						business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first
						time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly
						served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an
						abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with
						the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After
						Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and
						again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made
						clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses
						associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests
						to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No.
						232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Amneal			service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from
City of Galax, Virginia	1:19-op-45243	LLP Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	Defendant.

City of Galax, Virginia	1:19-op-45243	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
City of Galax, Virginia	1:19-op-45243	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
									On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel then filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,							prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed. Further, while Defendant initially disputed service in this case in its January 30, 2023 status report, Defendant subsequently filed an amended status report that no longer disputes that it was properly served in this case. Therefore, there is no dispute about proper service and the case
City of Galax, VA	1:19-op-45243	· ·	Yes		KVK-Tech	No	Yes	2/24/2023	should not be dismissed against this Defendant.

	T	1		1	1		
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that
							Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
							cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
							effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
							if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
							tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel
							sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant
							did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth
							business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first
							time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties'
							agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly
							served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an
							abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with
							the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After
							Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and
							again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made
							clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses
							associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests
							to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No.
							232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Amneal			service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from
Henry County, Virginia	1:19-op-45245	LLP Ye.	es	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes In F	Process	Defendant.
							On January 20, 2010. Defendant and subdivision according to the terms of any idea was different at
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that
							Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
							effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
							if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
							tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel
							sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant
							did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth
							business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first
							time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties'
							agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly
							served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an
							abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with
							the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After
							Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and
							again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made
							clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses
							associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests
							to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No.
				Amneal			232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Pharmaceuticals of			service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from
Henry County, Virginia	1:19-op-45245	LLP Ye	25	New York, LLC	Yes In F	Process	Defendant.
rielli y Coulity, viigiilia	1.13 OP 132 13			INCW TOTK, LLC	1103	100033	Defendant.

								On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that
								Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
								cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
								effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
								if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
								tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel
								sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant
								did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth
								business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first
								time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties'
								agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly
								served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an
								abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with
								the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After
								Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and
								again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made
								clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses
								associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests
								to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 6 6c, ECF No.
		Careford Haidon Charre		A				232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of
Henry County, Virginia	1:19-op-45245	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Tiemy councy, virginia	1.13 OF 13213		163	That maccaticals, me.	103	111100033		Scientific
								On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant.
								Subdivision counsel then filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because
								the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been
								prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be
								dismissed. Further, while Defendant initially disputed service in this case in its January 30, 2023
								status report, Defendant subsequently filed an amended status report that no longer disputes that
Henry County, VA	1:19-op-45245	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes	KVK-Tech	No	Yes	2/24/2023	it was properly served in this case. Therefore, there is no dispute about proper service and the case should not be dismissed against this Defendant.
Them y county, the	1.13 00 .52 .5			NAME TO SECOND	110		2/24/2023	it would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that
								had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of
								the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant
								did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business
								day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision
								counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement.
								Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective
								the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims
								for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to
								the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been
								properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Subdivision
								counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and requested a
								waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case
								Management Order, Defendant has an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with
								serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service
								pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision
								counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the
								court returns a signed summons. The subdivision's ongoing efforts to perfect service, combined
								with Defendant's actual notice of this lawsuit, further constitute good cause under Rule 4(m) to
								provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court does not find good cause
								here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) [JT1] to provide more time for
								service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice would
								prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar
		Sanford Hoislor Chara						circumstances where "a defendant is already before the court in a consolidated action and
City of Alexandria, VA	1:19-op-45246	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		'presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [] Plaintiffs would refile their complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources." In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine
City of Alexandria, VA	1.13-0p-43240	LLI	103	WAY-16CH	103	1111100033		complaint, resulting in a waste of Judicial resources. In the Suboxone (pulphenor) printe

City of Alexandria, Virginia	1:19-op-45246	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	it would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, in had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service vere the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, edid not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the cort counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years I for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find the properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to pe counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. Aff unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defe waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has ma Management Order, Defendant has an obligation "to avoid unnecessary e serving the summons and, absent good cause [should have] grant[ed] pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 [f. 6c, counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will ef court returns a signed summons. The subdivision's ongoing efforts to per with Defendant's actual notice of this lawsuit, further constitute good cau provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) [JT1] to pro service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal with prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead circumstances where "a defendant is already before the court in a consol 'presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [] Plaintiffs' complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources." In re Suboxone (Buj it would accept servic	would be effective as of except that if defendant as of the tenth business inplaint, subdivision a parties' agreement. Int, service was effective later, Defendant claims at was served according to that Defendant has been erfect service. Subdivision the Defendant and requested a ide clear in its Case expenses associated with a requests to waive service ECF No. 232). Subdivision effect service, combined use under Rule 4(m) to at does not find good cause ovide more time for out prejudice would and of dismissal in similar idated action and would refile their prenorphine and ide the effective as of except that if defendant in as of the tenth business inplaint, subdivision are parties' agreement. Int, service was effective later, Defendant claims at was served according to that Defendant has been erfect service. Subdivision the Defendant and requested a ide clear in its Case expenses associated with a requests to waive service ECF No. 232). Subdivision effect service as soon as the effec
							unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defe waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has man Management Order, Defendant has an obligation "to avoid unnecessary eserving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed]	endant and requested a ide clear in its Case expenses associated with] requests to waive service
							counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will ef court returns a signed summons. The subdivision's ongoing efforts to per- with Defendant's actual notice of this lawsuit, further constitute good cau	ffect service as soon as the fect service, combined use under Rule 4(m) to
							provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) [JT1] to pro service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead	ovide more time for out prejudice would
							circumstances where "a defendant is already before the court in a consoli	idated action and
City of Alexandria, Virginia	1:19-op-45246	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	'presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [] Plaintiffs w complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources.'" In re Suboxone (Buj	
,	p -=	!	.		.		The first of the second	

	T	T	T				
Pittsylvania County, Virginia	1:19-op-45247	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Pittsylvania County, Virginia	1:19-op-45247	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

	T	T		T	T	1		1	
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal				On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
Pittsylvania County, Virginia	1:19-op-45247	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Defendant.
		Levin Papantonio							
City of Cullman (AL)	1:19-op-45248	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/25/2019	
City of Cullman, AL	1:19-op-45248	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	10/25/2019	
City of Norton Virginia	1.10 on 45340	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Vos		Amneal	Voc	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
City of Norton, Virginia	1:19-op-45249	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Defendant.

			Т		
City of Norton, Virginia	1:19-op-45249	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had on obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant h
orcy or reorcon, vingillia	1.13 Op 43243	163	New TOTK, LEC	in Floress	Defendant.
City of Norton, Virginia	1:19-op-45249	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
City of Norton, Virginia	1:19-op-45249	LLP Yes	Pharmaceuticais, inc.	res in Process	Defendant. Defendant initially disputed service in this case in its January 30, 2023 status report, but Defendant
City of Norton, VA	1:19-op-45249	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes	KVK-Tech	No	subsequently filed an amended status report that no longer disputes that it was properly served in this case. Therefore, there is no dispute about proper service and the case should not be dismissed against this Defendant.
City of Charles Town, West					
Virginia	1:19-op-45250	Skinner law Firm	Hikma	No	This Defendant is not named in the Complaint
City of Charles Town, WV	1:19-op-45250	Skinner law Firm	American Sales Company, Inc.	Yes	Dismissed 02/28/2023
City of Charles Town, WV	1:19-op-45250	Skinner Law Firm	Indivior	No	Dismissed 02/28/2023
·			Masters		
City of Charles Town, WV	1:19-op-45250	Skinner Law Firm	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Dismissed 03/22/2023
City of Charles Town, WV	1:19-OP-45250	Skinner Law Firm	TopRx	No	Dismissed 02/28/2023

	1	<u>, </u>		T	1		
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
							cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
							effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
							if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
							tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel
							sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant
							did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth
							business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first
							time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties'
							agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly
							served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an
							abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with
							the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and
							again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made
							clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses
							associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests
							to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No.
				Amneal			232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Pharmaceuticals of			service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from
Lee County, Virginia	1:19-op-45251	LLP Yes		New York, LLC	Yes In Pro	cess	Defendant.
							On leaves 20, 2010. Defendent and subdivision assumed a second to the second se
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
							cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
							effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
							if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
							tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel
							sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant
							did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth
							business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first
							time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties'
							agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly
							served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an
							abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with
							the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After
							Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made
							clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses
							associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests
							to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 \mathbb{P} 6c, ECF No.
							232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Amneal			service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from
Lee County, Virginia	1:19-op-45251	LLP Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes In Pro	ocess	Defendant.
· · ·	•	•	•	•		•	

								it would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that
								had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of
								the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant
								did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business
								day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision
								counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement.
								Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective
								the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims
								for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to
								the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been
								properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Subdivision
								counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. After Defendant
								unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and requested a
								waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case
								Management Order, Defendant has an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with
								serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service
								pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision
								counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the
								court returns a signed summons. The subdivision's ongoing efforts to perfect service, combined
								with Defendant's actual notice of this lawsuit, further constitute good cause under Rule 4(m) to
								provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court does not find good cause
								here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) [JT1] to provide more time for
								service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice would
								prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar
								circumstances where "a defendant is already before the court in a consolidated action and
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,						'presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [] Plaintiffs would refile their
Dickenson County, VA	1:19-op-45252	LLP	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process	complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources." In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine
								On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that
								Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
								cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
								effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
								if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
								tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel
								sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant
								did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth
								business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first
								time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties'
								agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly
								served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an
		1	1	1	1			abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with
								-
								the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After
								the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and
								the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made
								the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses
								the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests
								the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
								the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
Washington County, Virginia	1:19-op-45254	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1

	Τ				1	1	I	<u> </u>	
Washington County, Virginia	1:19-op-45254	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
Washington County, Virginia	1:19-op-45254	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant had not ligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 [co., ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph							A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on
Crowley County, Colorado	1:19-op-45255	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
City of Seminole, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			Ds have this one titled incorrectly, sb County for case 45260
Board of County									
Commissioners of Seminole County, OK	1:19-op-45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Seminole County Board of	,			_, _,				, ,	
County Commissioners,	4.40 45000	Negali Chini II	N =	4/2/222	I Illiano	N			
Oklahoma	1:19-op-45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	нікта	No			

			1				_		
County of Ionia, MI County of Ionia, Michigan	1:19-op-45261 1:19-op-45261	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No No	12/1/2022 12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical Mylan	Yes No	Yes	4/15/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Ionia, Michigan	1:19-op-45261	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
County of Livingston, MI	1:19-op-45262	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	4/15/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
.,	p	Skikos Crawford Skikos		, _, _, _		-		, -,	i e
		& Joseph			Amneal				A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Amneal on
City of Rock Springs, Wyoming	1:19-op-45265	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23.
Rock Springs, Wyoming	1:19-op-45265	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Hikma	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Hikma on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Hikma.
	2.25 OP 15205	Skikos Crawford Skikos							_, _,
		& Joseph							A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on
Rock Springs, Wyoming	1:19-op-45265	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	2/20/23. The request was denied by Mylan.

	1						
Page County, Virginia	1:19-op-45275	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service onm. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Page County, Virginia	1:19-op-45275	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After
									Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made
									clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No.
									232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal				service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from
Page County, Virginia	1:19-op-45275	LLP Skikos Crawford Skikos	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Defendant.
		& Joseph			Amneal				A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Amneal on
Cheyenne, Wyoming	1:19-op-45280	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
Cheyenne, Wyoming	1:19-op-45280	& Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Hikma	Vos	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Hikma on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Hikma.
Cheyenne, wyonning	1.15-0p-43280	Skikos Crawford Skikos	Tes	N/A	HIKIHa	Yes	NO	IN/A	2/17/23. The request was defiled by flikfila.
		& Joseph							A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on
City of Cheyenne, Wyoming	1:19-op-45280	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
					Associated Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
Jackson County, FL	1:19-op-45283	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	10/24/2019	
Jackson County, FL	1:19-op-45283	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	No		N/A	Defendant error alleging untimely PFS upload.
Jackson County, 1 L	1.19-0p-43283	Karrerty	163		WIIII-DIXIE	140		IN/A	Determant error aneging untimery 113 upload.
									The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
The City of Gulfport (GA)	1:19-op-45291				JM Smith	Yes			Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
				7/23/2019 &					
The City of Gulfport, Mississippi	1:19-op-45291	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC Blasingame, Burch,	Yes	12/11/2022	Amneal	No			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Montgomery County (GA)	1:19-op-45292	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Montgomery County, GA	1:19-op-45292	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Montgomery County, Georgia	1:19-op-45292	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	Mylan	No			
1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1		Blasingame, Burch,		, , ,	, ,	-			
Montgomery County, Georgia	1:19-op-45292	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	Amneal	No			
Montgomery County, Georgia	1:19-op-45292	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	Hikma	No			
	1.13 OP 43232	Blasingame, Burch,		12, 11, 2022					Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19.
Fayette County (GA)	1:19-op-45293	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Favotto County Coorsia	1.10 on 45303	Blasingame, Burch,	No	42/44/2022	Mulan	No			
Fayette County, Georgia	1:19-op-45293	Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Blasingame, Burch,	No	12/14/2022	iviyidii	No			
Fayette County, Georgia	1:19-op-45293	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							
Fayette County, Georgia	1:19-op-45293	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			

City of Prestonsburg, (KY) Lig-op-45294 Bryant Law Center Ves Quest Pharmaceuticals Ves In Process KVK-Tech Ves In Process Rentucky Lig-op-45294 Bryant Law Center Ves Bryant Law Center Ves In Process In Pr	i					,				
City of Prestonsburg, KY 1:19-op-45294 Bryant Law Center Yes KVK-Tech Yes In Process In	Į.									
The City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky The City of Prestonsburg (KY) The City of Prestonsburg (KY) The City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky The									•	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Rentucky 1:19-op-45294 Bryant Law Center Yes Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes In Process The City of Prestonsburg (KY) 1:19-op-45294 Bryant Law Center Yes JM Smith Yes In Process City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky 1:19-op-45294 Bryant Law Center Yes Mylan Yes In Process Request for Waiver of Service was communicated to counsel for Mylan (Rebecca Man 5, 2019, along with a copy the pleadings and a waiver form. Counsel for Plaintiff rece executed waiver form from Rebecca Mandel on July 3, 2019 via email. The executed was filed into the sea docket on July 15, 2019 (1:19-op-45296, R. Doc. 16, at 4). R. Chris Nevils, DA of Winn Process Propository on a round 10/10/2022 at 11:28am. Neblett, Beard & Arsenault Yes Mylan Yes Yes 7/3/2019 repository on a round 10/10/2022 at 11:28am. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA,				in Process	Yes		Yes	Bryant Law Center	1:19-op-45294	,
The City of Prestonsburg (KY) 1:19-op-45294 Bryant Law Center Yes JM Smith Yes In Process City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky 1:19-op-45294 Bryant Law Center Yes Mylan Yes In Process Request for Waiver of Service was communicated to counsel for Mylan (Rebecca Mands 5, 2019, along with a copy the pleadings and a waiver form. Counsel for Plaintiff rece executed waiver form from Rebecca Mandel on July 3, 2019 via email. The executed was filed into the case docket on July 15, 2019 (1:19-op-45296; R. Doc. 16, at 4). R. Chris Nevils, DA of Winn Process Neblett, Beard & PFS was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/1 Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded repository on or a round 10/10/2022 at 11:28am. Mylan Yes Yes 7/3/2019 repository on or a round 10/10/2022 at 11:28am. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA,	!			In Process	IIC Vos		Voc	Pryant Law Contor	1:10 on 45204	,
City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky 1:19-op-45294 Bryant Law Center Yes Mylan Yes In Process Request for Waiver of Service was communicated to counsel for Mylan (Rebecca Man 5, 2019, along with a copy the pleadings and a waiver form. Counsel for Plaintiff rece executed waiver form from Rebecca Mandel on July 3, 2019 via email. The executed was filed into the case docket on July 15, 2019 (1:19-op-45296; R. Doc. 16, at 4). R. Chris Nevils, DA of Winn Pers was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/1 Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded Parish, Louisiana 1:19-op-45296 Arsenault Yes Mylan Yes Yes 7/3/2019 repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA,				III FIOCESS	LLC Tes	Filatiliaceuticais EEC	163	Bryant Law Center	1.13-0p-43234	Rentucky
Request for Waiver of Service was communicated to counsel for Mylan (Rebecca Mar 5, 2019, along with a copy the pleadings and a waiver form. Counsel for Plaintiff rece executed waiver form from Rebecca Mandel on July 3, 2019 via email. The executed was filed into the case docket on July 15, 2019 (1:19-op-45296; R. Doc. 16, at 4). PFS was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/1 Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA,				In Process	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Bryant Law Center	1:19-op-45294	The City of Prestonsburg (KY)
Request for Waiver of Service was communicated to counsel for Mylan (Rebecca Mar 5, 2019, along with a copy the pleadings and a waiver form. Counsel for Plaintiff rece executed waiver form from Rebecca Mandel on July 3, 2019 via email. The executed was filed into the case docket on July 15, 2019 (1:19-op-45296; R. Doc. 16, at 4). PFS was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/1 Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA,	l			In Process	Vos	Mulan	Vos	Privant Law Contor	1.10 05 45304	City of Brostonshurg Kontucky
5, 2019, along with a copy the pleadings and a waiver form. Counsel for Plaintiff rece executed waiver form from Rebecca Mandel on July 3, 2019 via email. The executed was filed into the case docket on July 15, 2019 (1:19-op-45296; R. Doc. 16, at 4). PFS was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/1 R. Chris Nevils, DA of Winn Parish, Louisiana 1:19-op-45296 Arsenault Yes Mylan Yes Yes Yes 7/3/2019 Fersonitory on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA,				III Process	res	IVIYIAII	res	bryant Law Center	1:19-0p-45294	city of Prestonsburg, Rentucky
R. Chris Nevils, DA of Winn Parish, Louisiana 1:19-op-45296 1:19-op-4529	ff received the cuted waiver form	5, 2019, along with a copy the pleadings and a waiver form. Counsel for Plaintiff recexecuted waiver form from Rebecca Mandel on July 3, 2019 via email. The executed								
R. Chris Nevils, DA of Winn Parish, Louisiana 1:19-op-45296 Arsenault Yes Mylan Yes Yes Yes 7/3/2019 Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA,		was filed into the case docket on July 15, 2019 (1:19-op-45296; K. Doc. 16, at 4).								
Parish, Louisiana 1:19-op-45296 Arsenault Yes Mylan Yes Yes 7/3/2019 repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am. Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA,	n 10/10/2022.	PFS was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10,								
Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA,	paded to the PFS	Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploade						Neblett, Beard &		R. Chris Nevils, DA of Winn
			7/3/2019	Yes	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Arsenault	1:19-op-45296	Parish, Louisiana
named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver ru		·								
	·	·								
originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow	follow-ups.		2 /22 /222		.,	ļ	.,			
City of Brighton, Colorado 1:19-op-45298 Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Yes Hikma Yes 3/20/2023 Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3/20/2023		Yes	Hikma	Yes	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	1:19-op-45298	City of Brighton, Colorado
Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previou different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See	Ü									
Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waiver										
any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit ther		·								
prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present ti Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "De										
encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and	-									
cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since a	Since an Answer has	cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since								
not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting	uesting that the	not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by request								
Waivers be signed at the present time.	!	Waivers be signed at the present time.								
API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847)	l	API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847)								
●Øn May 11, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Sei	of Service of the	•Dn May 11, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esg., attaching a Waiver of S								
Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc										
Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.	' '									
●Øn June 23, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Am	its Amnoal	• Min June 22, 2019. Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Av								
Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:19-										
Doc Nos. 53 and 54).	: 1.15-0β-45505									
●Øn February 10, 2023, an email was re-forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting a	sting again a Maire-	all Echrupy 10, 2022, an amail was to forwarded to Atternational Control of the								
of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal		of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal								
Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (Note: we were aware based on an email exchange with Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq., fro	a from Illmor 9									
Berne, LLP, from May 29, 2019, in connection with a related case, City of Utica, New Y										
City of Lackawanna, New York Brindisi, Murad & Amneal Brindisi, Murad & Amneal						Amneal		Brindisi Murad &		City of Lackawanna New York
v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al. 1:19-op-45303 Brindisi Pearlman Yes Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes In Process API, based on as follows:		18-op-46359), that was filed by this law firm, that they would not agree to execute to								

									Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper
									address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below.
									Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint),
									"Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons
									and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)."
									Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters
									Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.
									Thatma by requesting that the waivers be signed at the present time.
									Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect
									address. (Doc No. 4840)
									Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters
									Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiff attempted
									service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore,
									improper and untimely.
									●Øn July 9, 2019, Masters was served at 3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036. The Affidavit of
									Service dated 7/9/19 for Masters Pharma was filed on August 4, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45303
									Doc No. 81).
		Brindisi, Murad &			Masters				•Dn February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of
City of Lackawanna, NY	1:19-op-45303	Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.
,	·				Masters				
City of Duluth, MN	1:19-op-45304	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
	<u> </u>							0/46/2040	
Meriwether County (GA)	1:19-op-45305	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Meriwether County, Georgia	1:19-op-45305	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Sheriff Chuck Smith, in his									
Official Capacity as Sheriff of									
Meriwether County (GA)	1:19-op-45306	LCHB	No	3/6/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Melton (Sheriff of Apping	1.15 op 15500	LCITE	110	3/0/2023	JULY STITLET	163	100	3/10/2013	Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent
	1.10 45207	LCUB	N	2/20/2022	Canadaa Ina	V	In Dunner		
County), GA	1:19-op-45307	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		3/17/2023). Praecipe to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Sheriff Mark Melton, in his									
Official Capacity as Sheriff of									
Appling County (GA)	1:19-op-45307	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.
Mark Melton, Georgia	1:19-op-45307	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Sheriff Mark Melton, in his	2.25 op .5507				1,				
·									
Official Capacity as Sheriff of									
Appling County, Georgia	1:19-op-45307	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
Sheriff Cullen Talton, in his									
Official Capacity as Sheriff of									
Houston County (GA)	1:19-op-45308	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Cullen Talton, Georgia	1:19-op-45308	LCHB	No	2/20/2023		No		3/10/2013	Na. 12. 3. 32. 11. 22. 11. 22. 11. 22. 11. 22. 11. 12. 12
Cullett Tattori, Georgia	1.13-0p-43300	LCTID	110	2/20/2023	iviyiaii	NO			
Sheriff Chris Steverson, in his									
Official Capacity as Sheriff of									
Telfair County (GA)	1:19-op-45313	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Steverson (Sheriff of Telfair									Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent
County), GA	1:19-op-45313	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		3/17/2023). Praecipe to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Chris Steverson, Georgia	1:19-op-45313	LCHB	No	2/20/2023		No			-,,,,
	1.13-0h-43313	LCIID	INU	2/20/2023	iviyiaii	INU			+
Sheriff Terry Deese, in his									
Official Capacity as Sheriff of									
Peach County (GA)	1:19-op-45314	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
Deece of Chariff of Day 1									
Deese, as Sheriff of Peach					Inc/American				
County, GA	1:19-op-45314	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Associated Pharmacies	No			
Sheriff Terry Deese, in his									
Official Capacity as Sheriff of									
Peach County, Georgia	1:19-op-45314	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
Terry Deese, Georgia	1:19-op-45314	LCHB	No	2/20/2023		No			
. arry beese, deorgia	2.10 OP 70014		110	2/20/2023	,				
					A: - t J				
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
Houlton Band of Maliseet,		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
Tribe	1:19-op-45315	Rafferty	No		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	10/24/2019	Tribes not required to file a PFS.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								

	1		T	T				
County of Sierra, NM	1:19-op-45322	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	s Yes	Yes	10/25/2019	
		Levin Papantonio		Amneal				
Board of County Commissioners	1:19-op-45323	Rafferty	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	10/25/2019	
								Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. **Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840) Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiffs attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely. **Dn July 16, 2019, Masters was served at 3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036. The Affidavit of Service dated July 16, 2019 for Masters Pharma was filed on August 4, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-
	4.40 4.7225	Brindisi, Murad &		Masters				45325 Doc No. 81). •Øn February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of
Wilkes-Barre Township, PA	1:19-op-45325	Brindisi Pearlman	Yes	Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.
								As demonstrated below, Plaintiffs have complied with service of process and have filed Waivers in the cases listed below. They were improperly included in Value Drug's submission. Value Drug - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4843) • The Waivers of
Wilkes-Barre Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45325	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	9/8/2019	Service dated August 26, 2019 were filed on September 8, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45325 Doc Nos. 95 and 96). As such, this case should not have been listed in Value Drug's submission in Doc No. 4843.
								Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548). Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847)
								•On May 19, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, API Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.
								•On July 1, 2019, an email was again sent to Attorney Cosgrove requesting signed Waivers for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.
								•On July 1, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:19-op-45325 Doc Nos. 64 and 70).
Wilkes-Barre Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma, L.P, et al.	1:19-op-45325	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		•IDn July 1, 2019, an email was received from Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq. returning Waivers for Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. However, she did not return a signed Waiver for Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., rather requested a dismissal of same,
City of Superior, WI	1:19-op-45331	Keller Postman LLC	No	Masters 2/21/2023 Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c

		Levin Papantonio							
cotland County (NC)	1:19-op-45336	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/19/2020	
		Levin Papantonio							
Scotland County (NC)	1:19-op-45336	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceutica	ls Yes	Yes	2/19/2020	
		Levin Papantonio							
Lafayette County (MS)	1:19-op-45341	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/3/2019	
Roseau County	1:19-op-45344	Motley Rice	Yes		Thrifty Drug Stores	Yes	Yes	10/17/2019	Waiver of the Service of Summons for Roseau County, MN was signed and returned by counsel John Haggerty on behalf of Thrifty Drug Stores, Inc. d/b/a Thrifty White Warehouse #899 on 10/17/2019, which states on its face that, "If the waiver is signed and returned, [defendant] can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or service."
toscaa county	1.15-0p-45544	Wolley Mee	163		Thinty Drug Stores	163	1103	10/17/2013	Summons of Service.
Aroostook Band of Micmacs	1:40 on 45240	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacie	os Vas	No	00/00/00	Commons issued and qualities officiality of consists. Tribes were not required to complete DEC
ALOOSTOOK BAIIG OF WIICHTACS	1:19-op-45349	Levin Papantonio	No		ASSOCIATED FIIdITIACIE	:5 165	No	00/00/00	Summons issued and awaiting affidavit of service. Tribes were not required to complete PFS.
Lower Brule Sious Tribe	1:19-op-45350	Rafferty	No		Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	3/3/2023	Tribes were not required to submit PFS
LOWER Bruie Slous Tribe	1.13 OF 43330	Levin Papantonio	110		Dukota Brug	103	163	3/3/2023	This were not required to submit 113
Fairview Township, Pennsylvani	ia 1:19-op-45355	Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	03/06/2023	
		Levin Papantonio	1			† <u></u>	1.55	- 3//	
White Earth Nation	1:19-op-45357	Rafferty	No		Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	03/03/23	Tribes were not required to submit PFS
	·				Masters				
Yellow Medicine County, MN	1:19-op-45358	Keller Postman LLC	No		2/21/2023 Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ₱6c
					Masters				
Bannock County, ID	1:19-op-45359	Keller Postman LLC	No		2/21/2023 Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
David Davis, Sheriff of Bibb		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/13/19.
County, Georgia	1:19-op-45360	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	n/a	Mylan	Yes	Yes	9/13/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 3/27/20.
David J. Davis, in his Official									
Capacity as Sheriff of Bibb		Blasingame, Burch,							
County (GA)	1:19-op-45360	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	n/a	JM Smith	No			
David J. Davis, In His Official									
Capacity as Sheriff of Bibb		Blasingame, Burch,			Let				
County, Georgia	1:19-op-45360	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	n/a	Hikma	No			
David J. Davis, in His Official		Diania anno Dunch							
Capacity as Sheriff of Bibb	1:19-op-45360	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	n/a	Amneal	No			
County, Georgia	1.19-0p-45560	Garraru & Asiliey, P.C.	INO	11/ d	Annear	INO			
William C. Massee, Jr., in his Official Capacity as the Sheriff	4.40 45264	LOUD			2/24/2022 114.5 114	W	W .	0/45/2040	W
of Baldwin County (GA)	1:19-op-45361	LCHB	No		3/21/2023 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.
William C. Massee, Jr., in his Official Capacity as the Sheriff of Baldwin County, Georgia	1:19-op-45361	LCHB	No		2/20/2023 Amneal	No			
William C. Massee, Jr., Sheriff									
of Baldwin County, Georgia	1:19-op-45361	LCHB	No		2/20/2023 Mylan	No			
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal		<u> </u>		waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
Johnson County, Missouri	1:19-op-45363	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							Budington Days Company (IM Smith) provided executed an executed universel consider. The
Howell County (MO)	1:19-op-45368	Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	Burlington Drug Company (JM Smith) provided executed an executed waiver of service. The executed waiver of service was filed on the docket on 2/14/2023.
Howell County (MO)	1.19-0p-45566	Skikos Crawford Skikos		IN/A	JIVI SITIILIT	162	res	2/14/2023	executed waiver of service was filed off the docket off 2/14/2023.
		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
Howell County, Missouri	1:19-op-45368	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Howell County, Missouri	1.19-0p-45508	Skikos Crawford Skikos		IN/A	Filaililaceuticais, ilic.	163	INO	IN/ A	Price rule 4(u) and civio-1 was sent to Annied on 2/17/25.
		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
City of Harrisonville, Cass		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
County, Missouri	1:19-op-45369	Betram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Source, imissouri	2.13 OF 43303	Goldfarb & Huck Roth	103	13/7	i narmaceuticais, inc.	1.03	110	14/7	The state stay and enter a massement minimization 2/11/25.
Snohomish County, WA	1:19-op-45370	Riojas	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			
ionomism country, vva	1.13-0p-43370	Iniojus	163		IVA IV- I COII	INO	L		<u> </u>

	•		.	•		1			
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							
		Lister Frost Injury							
		Lawyers							
		Andrews Thornton							
		Higgins Razmara							Plaintiff is a Tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The
		Walkup, Melodia, Kelly							Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18
		& Schoenberger							Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not
Three Affiliated Tribes	1.10 am 45276	•		N1 / A	Deliete Davie	NI-		21/2	
Three Affiliated Tribes	1:19-op-45376	Robins Kaplan		N/A	Dakota Drug	No		N/A	apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
Wabaunsee County Kansas and		& Joseph							waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
Tim Liesmann, Wabaunsee		Wagstaff & Cartmell							FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Henry Schein on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Henry
County	1:19-op-45377	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Henry Schein	Yes	No	N/A	Schein.
		Levin Papantonio							
Callaway County, MO	1:19-op-45378	Rafferty	Yes		Sandoz/Novartis	No	Yes	N/A	Defendant error alleging untimely PFS upload.
Callaway County, MO v.		Levin Papantonio			Pharmacy Buying				
	1:19-op-45378	Rafferty	Yes		Association	Yes	Yes	12/6/2019	
	1.13 06 .3370	Skikos Crawford Skikos	. 65		7.0500.04.0			12, 0, 2013	
		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
The City of Fills at Manager									
The City of Elkhart, Morton		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
County, Kansas	1:19-op-45380	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
The Board of County		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
Commissioners for Elk County,		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
Kansas, et al.	1:19-op-45382	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
,	'							ĺ	
The Board of County		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
Commissioners for Greenwood		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Ammaal				
County, Kansas and Joe Lee,		•			Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
Greenwood County Attorney	1:19-op-45384	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Board of County		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
Commissioners for Greenwood		& Joseph							
County, KS, et al v. Purdue		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Pharmacy Buying				Pharmacy Buying Association states in their submission to the Court that service was effective in
Pharma L.P. et al	1:19-op-45384-DAP	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Association	Yes	Yes	12/9/2023	2019.
Douglas County, MO v. Purdue	'	Levin Papantonio		,	Pharmacy Buying				
Pharma L.P. et al	1:19-op-45386	Rafferty	Yes		Association	Yes	Yes	12/6/2019	
Board of County	1.13 OP +3300	Skikos Crawford Skikos	103		Association	103	103	12/0/2013	
•									
Commissioners of Finney		& Joseph							
County, Kansas, and Thomas		Wagstaff & Cartmell							Burlington Drug Company (JM Smith) provided executed an executed waiver of service. The
(KS)	1:19-op-45387	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	executed waiver of service was filed on the docket on 2/14/2023.
The Board of County		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
Commissioners for Stanton		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
County, Kansas and David		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
Black, Stanton County Attorney	1·19-on-45388	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Diaming Station County Attorney	1.13 OP 73300	Skikos Crawford Skikos		11/11	i narmaccaticais, ilic.	1.03	1,0	INJ PA	. The state stay and error 1 was some to runned on 2/17/25.
									Coming by an anymody use provide solvented by any live any standard for the solution of the so
		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
The City of Manter, Stanton		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
County, Kansas	1:19-op-45389	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
The Board of County		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
Commissioners for Meade		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
County, Kansas and Clay		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
Kuhns, Meade County Attorney	1:19-op-45390	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
,		Skikos Crawford Skikos	1			1		.,,,,	
									Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by conding a request for waiver of contine. The
TI - 6'' - 1111		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
The City of Ulysses, Grant		Wagstaff & Cartmell		1.	Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
•	1:19-op-45392	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
The Board of County									
Commissioners for Morton		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
County, Kansas and Eric			1	i e		1	I		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
-		Wagstaff & Cartmell							waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
County, Kansas and Eric Witcher, Morton County Attorney	1:19-op-45393	Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal	Yes	No	N/A	waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.

The Board of County		Skikos Crawford Skikos						
Commissioners for Grant		& Joseph						Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
County, Kansas and Jessica		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal			waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
Akers, Grant County Attorney	1:19-op-45394	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos						
		& Joseph						
		Lister Frost Injury						
		Lawyers						
		Andrews Thornton						
		Higgins Razmara						Plaintiff is a Tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The
		Walkup, Melodia, Kelly						Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18
Chippewa Cree Tribe of the		& Schoenberger						Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not
Rocky Boy's Reservation	1:19-op-45395	Robins Kaplan		N/A	Dakota Drug	No	N/A	apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
City of Ada, OK	1:19-op-45400	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes Yes	3/16/2023	
Gooding County, Idaho	1:19-op-45404	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No		
	1:19-op-45404	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	No		
Knox County, MO v. Purdue		Levin Papantonio	1.00		Pharmacy Buying			
-	1:19-op-45406	Rafferty	Yes		Association	Yes Yes	4/15/2021	
							4/13/2021	
	1:19-op-45407	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		•	No		
Camas County, Idaho	1:19-op-45407	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No		
		Levin Papantonio						
	1:19-op-45408	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes Yes	12/6/2019	
Randolph County, MO v.		Levin Papantonio			Pharmacy Buying			
	1:19-op-45409	Rafferty	Yes		Association	Yes Yes	12/3/2019	
City of Seven Hills, Ohio	1:19-op-45413	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No		
	1:19-op-45413	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022		No		
	1:19-op-45415	Fulmer Sill	Yes	22/22/2022	GCP Pharma	Yes Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:19-op-45416	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022		No les	3/10/2023	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>			
Pettis County, Missouri	1:19-op-45416	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	iviyian	No		
Covington County, Mississippi	1:19-op-45417	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No		
Covington County, Mississippi	1:19-op-45417	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No		
Town Of Summit, Mississippi	1:19-op-45418	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No		
, ii	'	·						
Town of Summit, Mississippi	1:19-op-45418	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No		
	1:19-op-45419	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022		No		
	•							
	1:19-op-45419	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022		No		
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1:19-op-45420	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022		No		
Forsyth County, Georgia	1:19-op-45420	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Mylan	No		
Sandoval County, New Mexico	1:19-op-45421	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No		
Sandoval County, New Mexico	1:19-op-45421	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No		
City Of Mound Bayou,								
	1:19-op-45422	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No		
City of Mound Bayou,	10 OF 70722	apa omonin		1, 5, 2025		1		
	1:10 on 45422	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/2/2022	Mylan	No		
	1:19-op-45422		No	1/3/2023		No		
	1:19-op-45423	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No		
Walton County, Florida	1:19-op-45423	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	No		
City Of Saint Paul, Minnesota	1:19-op-45424	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No		
City of Saint Paul, Minnesota	1:19-op-45424	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	No		
					, .			
Town Of Centerville Tennessee	1:10 on 45425	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/29/2022	Hikma	No		
Town of Centerville Tennessee	1.19-0p-45425	Napoli Silkolilik	INO	12/29/2022	ПКШа	NO		
Town of Centerville, Tennessee	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/29/2022		No		
	1:19-op-45426	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/2/2023		No		
Maverick County, Texas	1:19-op-45426	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/2/2023	Hikma	No		
Town Of Fort Deposit, Alabama	1:19-op-45427	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Hikma	No		
Town of Fort Deposit, Alabama	1:19-op-45427	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Mylan	No		
		1 11 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	1		1 , .	<u> </u>	L	

The property of the property o	Taurachia Official III 5						T T		
The company of the co	Township Of Saddle Brook,	1.10 on 45421	Noneli Chlednik	No	1/2/2022	Hilana	No		
12	·	1:19-0p-45431	ічарон эпконік	NO	1/3/2023	нікта	INO I		
1900 person of section of the control of the contro	· ·	1:10 on 4E421	Nanali Shkalnik	No	1/2/2022	Mulan	No		
sech affidient of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representation of Masters Pharmacourical Thus, Peed, RV, P. (A)(13) a statisfied and WAI's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters had felled within owe trans the maligration that Wai's clients' service is deemed involved. Masters' deldevin reading the issue more than satisfies the requirements for pool cause as to WAI's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio alw, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service deamnor or an entry of appearance; in Case, V. Williams, 350 K & 303 (0.11.05). It is understand that Masters is never than which was not entry of appearance; in Case, v. Williams, 350 K & 303 (0.11.05). It is understand that Masters is never than Wai's client entry of appearance; in Case, v. Williams, 350 K & 303 (0.11.05). It is understand that Masters is never than Wai's client entry of appearance; in Case, v. Williams, 350 K & 303 (0.11.05). It is understand that Masters is never than Wai's client entry of appearance; in Case, v. Williams, 350 K & 303 (0.11.05). It is understand that Masters is never than Wai's client service an appearance, vower if WAI's alleged deficiency in a service, in addition, the fast that Wai's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with so only because Masters was uncompanied without asset and to consider that the Masters' was never in the Court's Case Management Order (Ott. 23, 2p. 10, 16 (0.1) obligate defendants to was everice. Masters' was never of service of summons. Masters of appearance was more of the appearance of appearance of master was processed of many monts that roughled the efforts without cause and forced wilds to serve summons on Masters was processed of appearance of the appearance of the other of summons. Masters is to every appearance of the course of the course of the course of the course of the course of the course of the course of the course of the co	City of Hopewell, VA					Masters		6/25/2019	each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
Levin Papantonio Louisiana Wholesale Drug Yes Yes 2/20/2023 Tribes were not required to complete PFS. Tribes were not required to complete PFS.	County of Berkeley SC	1:19-op-45436	Weitz & Luxenherg	No	12/1/2022		Yes Yes	6/25/2019	each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice
Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana 1:19-op-45438 Rafferty No Drug Yes Yes 2/20/2023 Tribes were not required to complete PFS. Complete PFS. Com	County of Berkeley, SC	1:19-op-45436		No	12/1/2022		Yes Yes	6/25/2019	plaintiffs.
Fulton Country (OH) 1:19-op-45440 20Il & Kranz LLC No 3/22/2023 Prescription Supply No 1:19-op-45440 20Il & Kranz LLC No 3/22/2023 Mylan No Four Country Board of Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Services (OH) 1:19-op-45440 20Il & Kranz LLC No 3/22/2023 Prescription Supply No 3/22/2023 Prescription Supply No 3/22/2023 Prescription Supply No 3/22/2023 Prescription Supply No 3/22/2023 Prescription Supply No	Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana	1:19-op-45438		No			Yes Yes	2/20/2023	Tribes were not required to complete PFS.
Board of Commissioners of Fulton County, Ohio 1:19-op-45440 Zoll & Kranz LLC No 3/22/2023 Mylan No Four County Board of Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Services (OH) 1:19-op-45440 Zoll & Kranz LLC No 3/22/2023 Prescription Supply No Simmons Hanly Conroy,		4.40	7.11.0.12		0 1 1	.	<u> </u>		
Fulton County, Ohio 1:19-op-45440 Zoll & Kranz LLC No 3/22/2023 Mylan No Four County Board of Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Services (OH) Simmons Hanly Conroy, Simmons Hanly Conroy,		1:19-op-45440	Zoll & Kranz LLC	No	3/22/2023	Prescription Supply	No		
Four County Board of Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Services (OH) Simmons Hanly Conroy, Simmons Hanly Conroy,		1.10 45.440	7-11 0 1/2-2 11 0	N -	2/22/222	N Andrew	_{N-}		
Health Services (OH) 1:19-op-45440 Zoll & Kranz LLC No 3/22/2023 Prescription Supply No Simmons Hanly Conroy, Simmons Hanly Conroy, Image: Control of the co	Four County Board of Alcohol,	1:19-op-45440	ZOII & Kranz LLC	No	3/22/2023	Mylan	NO		
Simmons Hanly Conroy,		4.40	7.11.0.14		2/22/2	Barrier 6 d	<u> </u>		
	nealth Services (OH)	1:19-op-45440			3/22/2023	Prescription Supply	INO		
	Town of Monroe Connections	1:10 on 45441	LLC	, No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No		

		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Town of Monroe, Connecticut		LLC		11/16/2022	Mylan	No			
-	1:19-op-45443	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/21/2022		No			
Johnson County, Kansas	1:19-op-45443	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/21/2022	Mylan	No			
1		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Avoyelles Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45444	LLC	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale		.,	0/44/2040	
	1:19-op-45444	LLC	Yes		Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Avoyelles Parish Police Jury	4.40 45.444	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC			JM Smith		W	9/12/2019	
(LA) Avoyelles Parish Police Jury,	1:19-op-45444	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	Yes		JIVI SITIILII	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
	1:19-op-45444	LLC	Yes		Mylan	Voc	Yes	9/11/2019	
Louisiaria	1.19-0p-45444	LLC	162		iviyiaii	Yes	res	9/11/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Calcasieu Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45445	LLC	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			
calcasted Fallshir office sary	1.15 op 45445	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	163		Louisiana Wholesale	163			
Calcasieu Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45445	LLC	Yes		Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						0, ==, ===	
Calcasieu Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45445	LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/6/2019	
, ,								-, -,	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Ouachita Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45446	LLC	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Louisiana Wholesale				
Ouachita Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45446	LLC	Yes		Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Ouachita Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45446	LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
Ouchita Parish Police Jury,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Louisiana	1:19-op-45446	LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	The City of Laguna Beach served its PFS to the PFS repository, and also directly served it upon
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							Mylan's counsel. The City of Laguna Beach previously sent the PFS to the repository on 12/29/22, and again directly to Mylan's counsel on 2/13/23. Below is the email where Mylan's counsel was served the PFS directly. From: Darleen Perkins <dperkins@robinsonfirm.com> Sent: Wednesday, March 8, 2023 6:48 PM To: rebecca.mandel@hoganlovells.com Cc: Kevin Calcagnie <kcalcagnie@robinsonfirm.com>; Lila Razmara <lrazmara@robinsonfirm.com>; Tracy Hughes <thughes@robinsonfirm.com> Subject: IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION OPIATE LITIGATION (Mylan) - City of Laguna Beach, CA - MDL 2804; Case No. 1:19-op-45447 Government Plaintiff Fact Sheet IN RE: NATIONAL OPIATE LITIGATION Case No. 1:17-MD-2804 City of Laguna Beach, California Government Plaintiff Fact Sheet Dear Ms. Mandel: Attached and served herewith, please find the City of Laguna Beach, California, Government Plaintiff Fact Sheet. Very truly yours, Darloop Parkins, Paralogal.</thughes@robinsonfirm.com></lrazmara@robinsonfirm.com></kcalcagnie@robinsonfirm.com></dperkins@robinsonfirm.com>
		& Joseph		- / /					Darleen Perkins, Paralegal
City of Laguna Beach, California	1:19-op-45447	Robinson Calcagnie	No	2/13/2023	ıvıylan	No			ROBINSON CALCAGNIE, INC.
		Cinaman - H			Ammaal				
Sahina Darich Dalica Lucu	1:10 on 45449	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	Voc		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Vos			CLC Not Duraying
Sabine Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45448	LLC Simmons Hanly Conroy,	Yes		rnarmaceuticals, Inc.	162			SHC Not Pursuing
Sabine Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:10-on 45440	LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Vac	νως	9/6/2019	
Sabille Parish Police Jury (LA)	1.13-Uh-42448	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	162		Louisiana Wholesale	Yes	Yes	3/0/2013	
Sahine Darich Doliny Juny	1:19-op-45448	LLC	Yes			Vac	νως	9/11/2019	
Sabine Parish Policy Jury	1.13-Uh-42448	LLC	162		Drug	Yes	Yes	3/11/2013	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
City of Lake Charles	1:19-op-45449	LLC	Vos			Vos			SHC Not Burguing
City of Lake Charles	1.15-0p-45443	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	162		1	SHC Not Pursuing
City of Lake Charles	1:19-op-45449	LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
City of Lake Charles	1> OP-43443	1220	103	<u> </u>	SIVI SIIIIUI	1.03	103	J, 12/2013	

		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Louisiana Wholesale				
City of Lake Charles, Louisiana	1:19-op-45449	LLC	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Amneal				
Evangeline Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45450	LLC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Louisiana Wholesale				
Evangeline Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45450	LLC	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Evangeline Parish Police Jury		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
(LA)	1:19-op-45450	LLC	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Amneal				
Vernon Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45451	LLC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Louisiana Wholesale				
Vernon Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45451	LLC	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
Vernon Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45451	LLC	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Amneal				
Morehouse Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45452	LLC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Louisiana Wholesale				
Morehouse Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45452	LLC	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Morehouse Parish Police Jury		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
(LA)	1:19-op-45452	LLC	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/6/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Amneal				
East Carroll Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45453	LLC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
East Caroll Parish Police Jury,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
Louisiana	1:19-op-45453	LLC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
East Carroll Parish Police Jury		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
	1:19-op-45453	LLC	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Louisiana Wholesale				
East Carroll Police Jury	1:19-op-45453	LLC	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Amneal				
West Carroll Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45454	LLC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Louisiana Wholesale				
West Carroll Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45454	LLC	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
West Carroll Parish Police Jury		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
(LA)	1:19-op-45454	LLC	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/6/2019	
Chatham County (NC)	1:19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/1/2019	
City of Canton (NC)	1:19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/1/2019	
City of Canton, a municipal								
corporation, Chatham County,								
North Carolina, and all other								
similarly situated v. Purdue				Amneal				
Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
City of Canton, a municipal								
corporation, Chatham County,								
North Carolina, and all other								
similarly situated v. Purdue				Amneal				
	1:19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
City of Canton, NC	1:19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	10/3/2019	
Town of Arlington, Tennessee	1:19-op-45471	Napoli Shkolnik	No 12/28/20	22 Hikma	No			
Town of Arlington, Tennessee	1:19-op-45471	Napoli Shkolnik	No 12/28/20	22 Mylan	No			
City of Millington, Tennessee	1:19-op-45474	Napoli Shkolnik	No 12/28/20	22 Hikma	No			
	1:19-op-45474	Napoli Shkolnik		22 Mylan	No			
	1:19-op-45495	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:19-op-45495	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:19-op-45496	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Guthrie, OK	1:19-op-45497	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	

City of Ohlahama City OK	1:10 45400	Enlarge Cill		CCD Db	W	V	2/45/2022	T
City of Oklahoma City, OK	1:19-op-45498	Fulmer Sill Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Inez (KY)	1:19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		
	1:19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center Yes		Mylan		In Process		
	·							
				Associated				
				Pharmacies				
				Inc/American				
	1:19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center Yes		Associated Pharmacies		Yes	3/24/2023	
City of Inez, KY	1:19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		
The City of Inez, Kentucky	1:19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
	1:19-op-45500	Fulmer Sill Yes		GCP Pharma		Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:19-op-45500	Fulmer Sill Yes		Sandoz Inc.		Yes	3/16/2023	
, ,				Masters				
City of Rochester, MN	1:19-op-45501	Keller Postman LLC No	2/21/2023	Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
			11/29/2022 - sent to					
			PFS counsel on					
County of Curry, OR	1:19-op-45512	D'Amore Law Group, P.C. No	11/21/22	KVK-Tech	No			
			11/29/2022 - sent to					
			PFS counsel on					
County of Curry, Oregon	1:19-op-45512	D'Amore Law Group, P.C. No	11/21/22	Hikma	No			
			11/29/2022 - sent to PFS counsel on					
County of Curry, Oregon	1:19-op-45512	D'Amore Law Group, P.C. No	11/21/22	Mylan	No			
county of carry, oregon	1.15 op 45512	D'Amore Law Group, 1.e. 140	11/21/22	iviyian	No			
The City of Long Beach,			10/29/2019 &	Amneal				
_	1:19-op-45517	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC Yes	12/11/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	12/17/2019	Executed Waiver by Paul J. Cosgrove
			10/29/2019 &					
Long Beach, MS	1:19-op-45517	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC Yes	12/11/2022	Winn-Dixie	No			
County of Northumberland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45555	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	11/8/2019	As demonstrated below, Plaintiffs have complied with service of process and have filed Waivers in the cases listed below. They were improperly included in Value Drug's submission. Value Drug - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4843) • The Waivers of Service dated November 6, 2019 were filed on November 8, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45555 Doc Nos. 116 and 117). As such, this case should not have been listed in Value Drug's submission in Doc 4843. Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840) Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiffs attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely. • Den August 26, 2019, Masters was served at 3617 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45052. The Affidavit of Service dated August 26, 2019 for Masters Pharma was filed on October 12, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-4555 Doc No. 109).
	1:19-op-45559	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman Yes Bryant Law Center Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical Mylan	Yes	In Process		•On February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.
City of Paintsville, KY	1:19-op-45559	Bryant Law Center Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		
The City of Paintsville, Kentucky	1:19-on 45550	Bryant Law Center Voc		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Vos	In Process		
THE CITY OF PAINTSVIIIE, KENTUCKY	1.13-0h-43233	Bryant Law Center Yes Levin Papantonio		rnaimaceuticais LLC	162	In Process		
County of Calhoun (MI)	1:19-op-45560	Rafferty Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	1/2/2020	
, , , ,	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•	•		•	-

				T	1	1			
H.W. "Billy" Hancock, in his Official Capacity as the Sheriff									
	1:19-op-45562	LCHB	No	3/6/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.
H.W. "Billy" Hancock in his Official Capacity as the Sheriff of Crisp County, Georgia	1:19-op-45562	LCHB	No	3/6/2023	Amneal	No			
#=## #									
H.W. "Billy" Hancock, Sheriff of Crisp County, Georgia	1:19-op-45562	LCHB	No	3/6/2023	Mylan	No			
City of Sheridan, Colorado	1:19-op-45572	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	,,,,	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
The City of Federal Heights,	1:19-op-45573	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Colorado	1.19-0p-43373	Keller Kolli back L.L.F.	163		HIKIIId	163	163	3/20/2023	reformation the perfected of 15/2025.
									Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, PGc, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. **Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840) Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiffs attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely. **Dn August 29, 2019, Masters was served at 3617 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036. The Affidavit of Service dated August 29, 2019 for Masters Pharma was filed on September 8, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45574 Doc No. 91).
Wright Township, PA	1:19-op-45574	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		•On February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.
Wright Township,									As demonstrated below, Plaintiffs have complied with service of process and have filed Waivers in the cases listed below. They were improperly included in Value Drug's submission. Value Drug - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4843) • The Waivers of Service dated November 6, 2019 were filed on November 8, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45574 Doc
Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45574	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	11/8/2019	Nos. 114 and 115). As such, this case should not have been listed in Value Drug's submission in Doc No. 4843.
That the Early Country	1.13 GP 43374	Simulative Community	163		value Drug	163		11/0/2013	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
County of Yuma, Arizona	1:19-op-45575	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Pocatello, ID	1:19-op-45578	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
Kingston Borough , Pennsylvania	a 1:19-op-45585	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/16/2020	Defendant error alleging untimely PFS upload.
		Levin Papantonio			_				bereindant error uneging untilitery 175 aproad.
	1:19-op-45615	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/18/2020	emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending
City of Nashville (GA)	1:19-op-45617	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed waiver
City of Nachvilla GA	1·19-on-45617	Conley Grigge Partin LLP	Ves		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Ves	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Associated
City of Nashville, GA	1:19-op-45617	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		Pharmacies; pending receipt of signed waiver

	1			1	1			
City of Nashville, Georgia v.				Amneal				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal
Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45617	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Nashville, Georgia v.				Amneal				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal
Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45617	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
								emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Hikma; pending receipt
City of Nashville, Georgia	1:19-op-45617	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes	Hikma	Yes	In Process		of signed waiver
								emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending
City of Lakeland (GA)	1:19-op-45618	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed waiver
				Associated				
				Pharmacies				
				Inc/American				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Associated
City of Lakeland, GA	1:19-op-45618	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		Pharmacies; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Lakeland, Georgia v.				Amneal				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal
Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45618	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
	·							
City of Lakeland, Georgia v.				Amneal				emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal
, , ,	1:19-op-45618	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
,		, , ,		Masters				
Boulder City, NV	1:19-op-45648	Keller Postman LLC	No 2/21/2023		Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
Source City, 144	2.13 SP 43040	Rener i Ostinari EEC	2/21/2023	Masters		110		
City of Mesquite, NV	1:19-op-45649	Keller Postman LLC	No 2/21/2023		Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
County Commission of Payne	1.19-0p-43043	Neller Pustilial LLC	2/21/2023	on narmaceutical	103	INO		Trainten interior to request perendant waive service pursuant to Civio foc
'	1.10 on 45052	Nanali Chladnik	Voc	Indivior	Vas	Vac	2/14/2022	
County, OK County Commission of Payne	1:19-op-45653	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
, ,	4.40 45.052	No. of Children	W.	Let			2/44/2022	
	1:19-op-45653	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Payne County Commission,							- / /	
Oklahoma	1:19-op-45653	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
		Brindisi. Murad &						Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, PGc, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. **Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840) Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiff attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely. **Dn September 17, 2019, Masters was served at 3617 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45040. The Affidavit of Service dated September 17, 2019 on file for Masters Pharma was filed on October 12, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45654 Doc No. 91).
Hanayar Township DA	1.10 on 45054	Brindisi, Murad &	Voc	Masters Pharmaceutical	Voc	In Drococc		•On February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.
Hanover Township, PA	1:19-op-45654	Dilliusi i calillali	Yes	i naimaceuticai	Yes	In Process		Service of Sammons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Fildina.
Hanover Township,								As demonstrated below, Plaintiffs have complied with service of process and have filed Waivers in the cases listed below. They were improperly included in Value Drug's submission. Value Drug - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4843) • The Waivers of Service dated November 11, 2019 were filed on November 12, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45654 Doc
• •		Brindisi, Murad &						No. 102 and 103).
Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma, LP., et al.	1:19-op-45654	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	11/12/2019	As such, this case should not have been listed in Value Drug's submission in Doc No. 4843
ו וומוווומ, ברי., כנ מו.	1.15-Up-43034	Dilliuisi redillildil	163	value Di ug	163	163	11/12/2019	As such, this case should not have been listed in value Drug's Submission in Doc No. 4843
								As demonstrated below, Plaintiffs have complied with service of process and have filed Waivers in the cases listed below. They were improperly included in Value Drug's submission. Value Drug - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4843) • The Waivers of
		D. C. J. C. C.						Service dated November 11, 2019 were filed on November 12, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45655 Doc
County of Lycoming v. Purdue	4.40	Brindisi, Murad &		V 1 - 5			44/42/225	Nos. 98 and 99).
Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45655	Brindisi Pearlman	Yes	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	11/12/2019	As such, this case should not have been listed in Value Drug's submission in Doc No. 4843.

Motors is claiming an issue with semi-self process, scribing they were served at an incorporal self-men. Control by Afficiary in pool facts, or level from based Veyrors as yet for based Programs, Service of the pool of the Service Afficiary or an incommendation of the Service Afficiary of the Service Afficiary of the Service Afficiary of the Service Afficiary of the Service Afficiary of the Service Afficiary of the Service Afficiary of the Service Afficiary of the Service Affic										
scores for cover any springeriors. The cover any springerior field robbs by Co. 22, Proc. Server of springeriors and completing or process and compl										
Affidation of Service dated september 13, 2019 for Masters Pharma was filed on October 12, 2019. [See Case 119—0-6555 Dec Case										address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. **Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840) Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiff attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio
Gentry of Lycoming, PA 119-09-45655 Brindial Population Ves Pharmaceurical Ves In Process Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharmac. Cuilborne Country (TN) 119-09-45658 Brindia Population) Leon Paparitoria Ves Ves MS Shiftery Ves MS Shiftery Ves Ves 1/23/2000 Cuilborne Country, TN 113-09-45688 Brindia Population Ves Ves Ves 1/23/2000 Affects Ves Ves 1/23/2000 On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service where main in subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service where main in subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service where main in subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service would be demended on truly within term of the date defendant warrant are play email acceptation would be demended on truly within term of the date defendant warrant are play email acceptation with the parties of agreement, provide would be demended on truly within the pulsaryous days, service would be demended on truly within the pulsaryous days, service would be demended on the pulsaryous days, service would be demended on the pulsaryous days, service would be demended on the pulsaryous days, service would be demended on the pulsaryous days, service would be demended on the pulsaryous days, service and the pulsaryous days service of a test grant subdivision counsels service, and the pulsaryous days service of a test grant subdivision counsels with the pulsaryous days service of a test grant subdivision counsels with the pulsaryous days service of a test grant subdivision counsels also sent Defendant at waiver of service the term that but was only displayed acress, subdivision counsel adult was served according to the purties 'agreement, Though with the complaint in the secure of service, subdivision counsel adults of the term and accepted the waiver of service on an										•Dn September 13, 2019, Masters was served at 3617 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio, 45040. The
Country (Fig. 139-op-46558 Sindisi Pearlman Ves Pharmaceutical Ves In Process Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defindant Masters Pharma. Claborne Country, TN 139-op-46558 Rafferty Ves JM Smith Ves Ves J733/2020 Claborne Country, TN 159-op-45658 Rafferty Ves TopRx Ves Ves J733/2020 On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia case, and under the effective as of the date definedant sear a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within the biosines skyle, solvie would be effective as of the date definedant sear a reply email and subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Now, years late a service of service and stop of the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement. The effect and the complaint of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effe										
Country (Fig. 139-op-46558 Sindisi Pearlman Ves Pharmaceutical Ves In Process Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defindant Masters Pharma. Claborne Country, TN 139-op-46558 Rafferty Ves JM Smith Ves Ves J733/2020 Claborne Country, TN 159-op-45658 Rafferty Ves TopRx Ves Ves J733/2020 On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia case, and under the effective as of the date definedant sear a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within the biosines skyle, solvie would be effective as of the date definedant sear a reply email and subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's general. Now, years late a service of service and stop of the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement. The effect and the complaint of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effect of the parties' agreement. The effe										
Claiborne County (TN) 139-op-45658 Rafferty Ves JA Smith Ves Ves 1/73/2020 Claiborne County, TN 119 op-45658 Rafferty Ves DA Smith Ves Ves 1/73/2020 Claiborne County, TN 119 op-45658 Rafferty Ves DA Smith Ves Ves 1/73/2020 On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel segreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sear a respirate segree that service except that if defendant of not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business days of longing the except that if defendant of not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business days of longing the except that if defendant of not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business days of longing subdivision counsel service beferedant the complaint, subdivision counsel service would not respond to that enables, our and the parties' agreement. Perfect and not respond to that enables, our and the parties' agreement. Perfect and not respond to that enables, our and the parties' agreement. Perfect and not respond to that it was a remarked acceptance of the parties agreement. Perfect and not respond to that the parties' agreement. This subdivision counsel additional time to perfect the service on long with the complaint, However, Defendant and a waiver of service on long with the complaint, However, Defendant and a waiver of service on long with the complaint, However, Defendant and a waiver of service on long with the complaint, However, Defendant and again requested a waiver of service buddivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Extractive of the antibution counsel additional time to perfect service. Extractive of the antibution counsel additional time to perfect service. Surface of the antibut	Control of the control DA	4.40	<u> </u>				W			
Calbome County (TN) 1:19-op-5558 Rafferty Yes IJA Smith Yes Yes 1/23/2020 Carbone County, TN 1:19-op-5558 Rafferty Yes TopRx Yes Yes 1/23/2020 On January 28, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service was email in subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service been served or file. The parties further agreed that service who the cases that had not you been served or file. The parties further agreed that service who the effective so of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within the business days, service would be deemed reply within the business days, service would be deemed reply within 50 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel's service so the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's semall. Now, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's semall. Now, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's semall. Now, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's semall. Now, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's semall. Now, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel semall. Now service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel semall. Now service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel semall. Now service was effective the tenth business day following counsel and semal replacement agreement. The province of service and according to the parties' agreement. This observation according to the parties' agreement. This observation according to the parties' agreement and according to the parties' agreement. This observation according to the parties' agreement and the parties' agreement and the parties' agreement and the parties' agreement an	County of Lycoming, PA	1:19-op-45655		Yes	Pi	narmaceuticai	Yes	In Process		Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.
Claiborne County, TN 1:19 op-45658 Rafferty Yes TopRx Yes Ves 1/23/2020 On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel agreed that service would be extractive as of the date defendant sent a reply email accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging recept of service, except that if defendant did not reply within the business day, following subdivision counsel's sensil. Within 90 active county in the times would be demanded in the complain in this case, in accordant effective as of the term business day following subdivision counsel's sensil. Note sensil. Within 90 active would be demanded in the complain in this case, in accordant effective the term business day following subdivision counsel's sensil. Note sensitive would be demanded and the complain in this case, in accordant effective as of the term business day following subdivision counsel's sensil. Note sensitive would be demanded and the complain in this case, in accordant with the complain in this case, in accordant with the complain in this case, in accordant with the case is accordance with the complain in this case, in accordance with the complain in this case, in accordance with the complain in this case, in accordance with the complain in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Belief and the case is accordance to the the complain in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. The complain in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. The complain in the tree with a service was effective the term the case is accordance to the term. This accordance to the counsel sensitive and the case is accordance to the term. This accordance that the complain in that it was not properly served, falling the case is accordan	Claiborne County (TN)	1:19-op-45658	· '	Yes	JN	/I Smith	Yes	Yes	1/23/2020	
On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a region peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral ad convolved peral advision counsel sant Defendant the tours and the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. The state of the term that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served addition for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. The short constitutes good that the defendant has been properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This short convolved peral advision convoired additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision convoired additional time to perfect service. Enrither, out of an abundance of cause to the service was serviced and an advision convoired additional time to perfect service. Enrither, out of an abundance of cause to the service was serviced with serving the summon an accusted the waiver of service form. After Defendant unsepected signature serviced signature serviced signature developed signature service, subdivision convoired policy dependent and an adjusting to convoire to the service was serviced with serving the summon and, absent good cause, (should have) granted requested waiver o					<u> </u>				-,,	
Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitution to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect the parties' agreement, one of a service, Further, out of an abundison counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundison counsel additional time to perfect the parties' agreement, one of a service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its count and again requested a waiver of service, but befindant has not responded. As this court has made clear in this revirg the summons and, absent good cause,, is hould have grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order, Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to Under the parties of the parties of the parties of the part	Claiborne County, TN	1:19-op-45658	Rafferty	Yes	To	ppRx	Yes	Yes	1/23/2020	
Fauquier County, Virginia v. Sanford Heisler Sharp, Amneal Amneal										Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
	Fauquier County, Virginia v.		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		A	mneal				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		1:19-op-45686	LLP	Yes	Pl	narmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		

							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this
Fauquier County, Virginia v. Mallinckrodt LLC, et al.	1:19-op-45686	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 occeptions of the date of the date of the date of the date of the summons and cause for its failure to
Fauquier County, Virginia v. Mallinckrodt LLC, et al.	1:19-op-45686	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

			<u> </u>					
Board of Supervisors, Prince William County, Virginia	1:19-op-45687	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	E C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Board of Supervisors, Prince William County, Virginia	1:19-op-45687	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of			I C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid annecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly
	1	1		New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		upon receipt from Defendant.

Board of Supervisors, Prince William County, Virginia	1:19-op-45687	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Northumberland County, Virginia	1:19-op-45688	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D

							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was
Northumberland County, Virginia	1:19-op-45688	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to
Northumberland County, Virginia	1:19-op-45688	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

				<u> </u>	<u> </u>		I	
								On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that
Halifax County, Virginia	1:19-op-45692	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
								On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
Halifax County, Virginia	1:19-op-45692	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

Halifax County, Virginia 1:	l:19-op-45692	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from De
City of Lexington, Virginia 1:	l:19-op-45693	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D

							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver
City of Lexington, Virginia	1:19-op-45693	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up
City of Lexington, Virginia	1:19-op-45693	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

	T		1	T				
Rockbridge County, Virginia	1:19-op-45694	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 occurred to the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
<i>J</i> 77 <i>J</i>	·							
Rockbridge County Virginia	1:19-00-45694	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from P
Rockbridge County, Virginia	1:19-op-45694	LLP	Yes		New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	upon receipt from Defendant.

Rockbridge County, Virginia	1:19-op-45694	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service orn. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defenda
Roanoke County, Virginia	1:19-op-45695	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service on many find the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of

	Г		T	T	1	1		1	
									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that
									Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
									cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
									effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
									if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
									tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint,
									subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties'
									agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was
									effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant
									claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served
									according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that
									Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect
									service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver
									of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver
									of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up
									with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this
									court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid
									unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should
					Ammonl				have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal Pharmaceuticals of				Order No. 1 oc, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to
Roanoke County, Virginia	1:19-op-45695	LLP	Yes		New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Roalloke County, Vilgilia	1.19-0p-45095	LLP	res		New fork, LLC	res	III PTOCESS		upon receipt from berendant.
									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that
									Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
									cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
									effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
									if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
									tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint,
									subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties'
									agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was
									effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant
									claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served
									according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that
									Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect
									service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver
									of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver
									of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up
									with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this
									court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid
									unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
									Order No. 1 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal				return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly
Roanoke County, Virginia	1:19-op-45695	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		upon receipt from Defendant.

City of Roanoke, Virgina	1:19-op-45696	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceutic	als LLC Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
City of Roanoke, Virgina	1:19-op-45696	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceutic New York, LLC			On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly

							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint,
City of Roangke Virgina	1:19.00.45696	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yas	Amneal	Ves	In Process	subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly
City of Roanoke, Virgina	1:19-op-45696	LLP	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	upon receipt from Defendant.
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Amneal			On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
City of Salem, Virginia	1:19-op-45697	LLP	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	upon receipt from Defendant.

						On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver
City of Salem, Virginia	1:19-op-45697	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
						On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid"
City of Salem, Virginia	1:19-op-45697	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1

						On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver
Floyd County, Virginia	1:19-op-45698	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes	In Process	of service on along with the complaint. However, betendant du not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
						On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
Floyd County, Virginia	1:19-op-45698	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC Yes	In Process	Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

	1						
Floyd County, Virginia	1:19-op-45698	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Alleghany County, Virginia	1:19-op-45700	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D

							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
							tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
Alleghany County, Virginia	1:19-op-45700	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
							cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was
							effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver
							of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Amneal			Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly
Alleghany County, Virginia	1:19-op-45700	* * *	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	upon receipt from Defendant.

Franklin County, Virginia	1:19-op-45701	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	E C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the menth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Franklin County, Virginia	1:19-op-45701	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	E C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the eighth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from

Franklin County, Virginia	1:19-op-45701	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Madison County, Virginia	1:19-op-45702	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D

	I	T		I					
Madison County, Virginia	1:19-op-45702	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
madison county, viiginia	1.13 06 13702		. 65		16.1., 220				apon coope non percusant
Madison County, Virginia	1:19-op-45702	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	2/16/2022	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
City of Mustang, OK City of Midwest City, OK	1:19-op-45708 1:19-op-45709	Fulmer Sill Fulmer Sill	Yes Yes		GCP Pharma GCP Pharma	Yes Yes		3/16/2023 3/16/2023	
only of innamed city, on	2.15 OF 45705	. aimer om	1.00		COL T HATTIN			0,10,2020	
BOCC of Pittsburg County, OK	1:19-op-45711	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Pittsburg County Board of	440 4574	5 1 671			no Processing		W	2/45/2022	
County Commissioners, OK Pittsburg County Board of	1:19-op-45711	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Pittsburg County Board of			1	l		1 '			
ICOUNTY COmmissioners						į i			
County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45711	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Oklahoma Pittsburg County Board of	1:19-op-45711	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Oklahoma	1:19-op-45711	Fulmer Sill Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma Mylan	Yes		3/20/2023	

						On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should
						have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
City of Change and Mining		Camfaud Haislau Chaus		Arrand		Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to
City of Chesapeake, Virginia v. Actavis, LLC, et al.	1:19-op-45712	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes	In Process	return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
						On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid
				Amneal		unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c. FCE No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to
City of Chesapeake, Virginia v.		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of		

City of Chesapeake, Virginia v. Actavis, LLC, et al. County of Walker (TX)	1:19-op-45712 1:19-op-45713	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Law Office of Mark A. Correro	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. JM Smith	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Accomack County, Virginia	1:19-op-45715	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P. 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from

	1							-	
Accomack County, Virginia	1:19-op-45715	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals New York, LLC	of Yes	In Proc	cess		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Accomack County, Virginia	1:19-op-45715	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals,					On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
City of Yukon, OK	1:19-op-45716	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes			6/2023	
City of Enid, OK	1:19-op-45717	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes			6/2023	
· ·	1:19-op-45717	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes			6/2023	
City of Owasso, OK City of Owasso, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45718	Fulmer Sill Fulmer Sill	Yes Yes	GCP Pharma Mylan	Yes			6/2023	
City Of Owasso, Okidifoffia	1:19-op-45718	ruillel 3III	162	Iviyiari	Yes	res	[3/16	6/2023	

City of Bristol, Virginia	1:19-op-45719	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
City of Bristol, Virginia	1:19-op-45719	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 of Ge, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from

	.	.						
City of Bristol, Virginia	1:19-op-45719	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceu	icals, Inc. Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to te Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virg cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging rif defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 dis subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordagreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mer according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good caused Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel of service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not row for service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision count has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant and absorbately grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 Order No. 1 P. 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated goo return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the upon receipt from Defendant.	ginia cases, including those of that service would be eccipt of service, except that deemed effective as of the eays of filing the complaint, ordance with the parties' agreement, service was and the eays are later, Defendant wition that it was served ee to either find that easel additional time to perfect also sent Defendant a waiver eturn an executed the waiver eivision counsel followed up ent has not responded. As this is nobligation "to avoid ent good cause, [should (d)(1)." (Case Management d cause for its failure to
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to tee Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virg cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging refedendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 do subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in according agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the partifective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mer according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good caused Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel of service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not referendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivith Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had a unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absociated grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4	ginia cases, including those of that service would be eccipt of service, except that deemed effective as of the easy of filing the complaint, ordance with the parties' agreement, service was and the end of the

	1	1		T	1	Γ	T	T	
Louisa County, Virginia	1:19-op-45720	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Louisa County, Virginia	1:19-op-45720	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 for CECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defenda
City of St. Albans (VT)	1:19-op-45721	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	2/27/2020	
City of St. Albans (VT)	1:19-op-45721	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/27/2020	
5.57 51 50 7 ND4/15 (V 1)	2.13 OP -3721		1.55	ļ	J Jillien	1.55	. 55	-, -, 1, 2020	

City of Hazelton, PA	1:19-op-45724	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, PGc, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. *Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840) **Dn February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma. *Please also note that the correct spelling is "Hazleton" not "Hazelton".
				Pharmaceutical, Inc.					
				listed City of Hazleton* as not serving a PFS on repository (as of 10/14/22). (Doc. No. 4847) •Per Judge Polster's order (Doc. #4664), the Government Plaintiff Fact Sheet and First Amended/ supplement thereto for the City of Hazleton, PA was emailed on October 12, 2022. Previous to that it was also filed on June 19, 2018. (See Case: 1:19-op-45724 - Doc No. 638-1). In response to the deficiency notice, plaintiff's counsel resent the PFS on					
City of Hazelton, Pennsylvania	1:19-op-45724	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes	2/15/23. *Please also note that the correct	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	No			
	·				Masters				
City of Chubbuck, ID	1:19-op-45729	Keller Postman LLC Levin Papantonio	No	2/21/2023	3 Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
City of Danville (VA)	1:19-op-45730	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/14/2020	
. ,		Levin Papantonio							
Pemiscot County (MO)	1:19-op-45733	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/27/2020	
Bestevit Court (200)	4.40 45-500	Levin Papantonio			0 1			2/27/2020	
Pemiscot County (MO)	1:19-op-45733	Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals Masters	res	Yes	2/27/2020	
Pine County, MN	1:19-op-45738	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
		Frank C Dudeneher, Jr., The Dudenhefer Law		<i>2,24,202.</i>					The PFS was submitted on 06/13/20 and again on 10/13/22, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 19-op-00155. Out of abundance of caution, a further PFS was placed in the repository on 02/14/2023, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 1-md-2804. The correct civil action number is shown in Column B. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/21/23, received
City of Austin, IN	1:19-op-45739	Firm LLC	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		02/22/23. The PFS was submitted on 06/13/20 and again on 10/13/22, bearing the incorrect civil action
City of Austin Indiana	1:19-op-45739	Frank C Dudeneher, Jr., The Dudenhefer Law Firm LLC	Vec		Mylan	Ves	In Process		number of 19-op-00155. Out of abundance of caution, a further PFS was placed in the repository on 02/14/2023, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 1-md-2804. The correct civil action number is shown in Column B. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/21/23, received
City of Austin, Indiana	1:19-0p-45/39	FIFM LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		02/22/23. The PFS was submitted on 06/13/20 and again on 10/13/22, bearing the incorrect civil action
City of Madison, IN	1:19-op-45740	Frank C Dudeneher, Jr., The Dudenhefer Law Firm LLC	Yes		Indivior	Vac	In Process		number of 19-op-00156. Out of abundance of caution, a further PFS was placed in the repository on 02/14/2023, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 1-md-2804. The correct civil action number is shown in Column B. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/21/23, received 02/22/23.
<u></u>	1.13-0p-43/40	riiiii LLC	163	-	maivioi	Yes	III FIOLESS		الارا درا دی.

							1		
City of Madison, Indiana	1:19-op-45740	Frank C Dudeneher, Jr., The Dudenhefer Law Firm LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		The PFS was submitted on 06/13/20 and again on 10/13/22, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 19-op-00156. Out of abundance of caution, a further PFS was placed in the repository on 02/14/2023, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 1-md-2804. The correct civil action number is shown in Column B. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/27/23.
City of Hoover, AL	1:19-op-45746	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		From review of internal records, waiver of Service sent on November 26, 2019 when filing its short-form amended complaint by regular mail to counsel of record. Upon notice of the deficiency, Waiver of Service again sent on 03.06.2023 to counsel of record by email. Attorney Stewart Alvis indicated willingness to accept service on client's behalf following further rulings related to January 3, 2023 Order of Court. Also sent by certified mail to Company
City of Hoover, Alabama	1:19-op-45746	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process		From review of internal records, waiver of service sent on November 26, 2019 when filing its short-form amended complaint by regular mail to counsel of record. Upon notice of the deficiency, waiver of Service again sent on 03.08.2023 to counsel of record by email and by certified mail to Company. (Certified, tracking no. 7021197000143107897)
		Wallace Jordan Ratliff &							From review of internal records, waiver of service sent on November 26, 2019 when filing its short-form amended complaint by regular mail to counsel of record. Upon notice of the deficiency, waiver of Service sent on 03.08.2023 to counsel of record by email and by certified mail to
City of Hoover, Alabama	1:19-op-45746	Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Company. (Certified, tracking no. 7021197000143107900), signed for by Heather Wheeler.
The City of Hoover, AL, a Municipal Corporation of the State of Alabama	1:19-op-45746	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Following amendment of Hoover's complaint on November 26, 2019, Hoover attempted waiver of service by mail to listed counsel of record. Upon notice of the deficiency, Hoover recognizes this waiver was either not sent or received, to wit: waiver of service is now being sought along with notice by certified mail.
				- /- / /	Masters				
City of Proctor, MN	1:19-op-45748	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
City of Mandeville, LA	1:19-op-45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023. Waiver of service executed in October 2022. Filed executed waiver of service into record
City of Mandeville, Louisiana	1:19-op-45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Drug	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	2/13/2023. Defendant removed from Amended Notice.
Mandeville City, LA	1:19-op-45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Mandeville City, Louisiana	1:19-op-45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Town of Pearl River, LA	1:19-op-45754	Leger & Shaw	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
remier realitately at	1115 CP 1575 1	zeger a onav			Amneal			5/1//2020	56 Not 5, process made 5/25/2025. Excented notally 5, 50 Not incu 5/27/2025.
To a Charles to the delication		1 0 Cl .	V		Pharmaceuticals of				N
Town of Pearl River, Louisiana Board of County Commissioners for Kiowa		Leger & Shaw	Yes			Yes	No		Not named as Defendant to suit.
	1:19-op-45755	Fulmer Sill Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc. GCP Pharma	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	3/16/2023 3/16/2023	
Board of County	1:19-op-45755	ruinei 3III	Yes		OCF FIIdIIIId	1.62	162	3/10/2023	
Commissioners of Stephens									
County (OK) Board of County Commissioners of Stephens	1:19-op-45756	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
•	1:19-op-45756	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Stephens									
•	1:19-op-45756	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of Stephens County, OK	1:19-op-45756	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/21/2023	
Stephens County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45756	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:19-op-45757	Fulmer Sill	Yes			Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Amneal				
Bingham County, Idaho	1:19-op-45758	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing

	1		1		1	T	1		
Bingham County, ID	1:19-op-45758	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	; Yes	Yes	11/25/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Bingham County, ID	1:19-op-45758	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Bingham County, Idaho	1:19-op-45758	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	No			
Board of County									
Commissioners of Johnston									
County, OK	1:19-op-45765	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Johnston County, OK	1:19-op-45765	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Johnston County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45765	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Fairfax County Board of		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal				On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P. 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly
Supervisors	1:19-op-45766	IIP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Voc	In Process		upon receipt from Defendant.
Juper visurs	1.13-0h-43/00	ILLL	162		Triiai iliaceuticais LLC	169	III FIOCESS		apon receipt nom berendant.

Defendant ages accept control of sum and a subdivision counter's types and the control of the state of the st	1	Т	T	Т	T	T	T	1		
Defendant would accept service vale amail in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases cases that had not yet been served or filled. The parties further agreed that sen effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging recept of a fill defendant did not reply within the business day, service would be deemed a tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Unknih so days of fill subdivision counsels and the beened a tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Unknih so days effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging recept of if defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' age effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, yet claims for the first time that it was not properly served, falling to mention that according to the parties' age-rement. This soldwistion counsel's email. Now, yet claims for the first time that it was not properly served, falling to mention that according to the parties' agreement. This soldwistion counsel admit according to the parties' agreement. This soldwistion counsel admit according to the parties' agreement. This soldwistion counsel admit according to the parties' agreement. This soldwistion counsel admit service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant day of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant day of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant day of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant day of service on along with the complaint with serving the summon and, absent good not count has made of the service on along with the complaint with serving the summon and, absent good not count has made of the service on the parties of the date of the date of the parties. Fairfax County Board of Supervisors 2.19-0-45766 1.29 Ves Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Ves Pharmaceuticals of Pharmaceuticals of Pharmaceuticals of Pharmaceuticals of Pharmaceuticals of Pharmaceuticals of Pharmaceuticals of Pharmaceuticals of Pharmaceuticals of	<i>'</i>	1:19-op-45766	• •	Yes		Pharmaceuticals of	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 **[P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt fro
City of Slidell, LA 1:19-op-45769 Leger & Shaw Yes KVK-Tech Yes Yes 3/17/2023 service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023 Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC Yes No No Not named as Defendant to suit. City of Slidell, Louisiana 1:19-op-45769 Leger & Shaw Yes New York, LLC Yes No Not named as Defendant to suit. Choctaw County, AL 1:19-op-45770 DeGaris Law No 10/28/2022 Indivior No Choctaw County, Alabama 1:19-op-45770 DeGaris Law No 10/28/2022 Mylan No No No Not named as Defendant to suit. Washington Parish Government v. Purdue Pharma Pharma Pharmaceuticals of Pharmaceutical	· ·	1:19-op-45766	-	Yes			Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Amneal Pharmaceuticals of Slidell, Louisiana 1:19-op-45769 Leger & Shaw Yes New York, LLC Yes No Not named as Defendant to suit. Choctaw County, AL 1:19-op-45770 DeGaris Law No 10/28/2022 Indivior No Choctaw County, Alabama 1:19-op-45770 DeGaris Law No 10/28/2022 Mylan No No No Not named as Defendant to suit. Washington Parish Government v. Purdue Pharma	City of Slidell, LA	1:19-op-45769	Leger & Shaw	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Choctaw County, AL 1:19-op-45770 DeGaris Law No 10/28/2022 Indivior No Choctaw County, Alabama 1:19-op-45770 DeGaris Law No 10/28/2022 Mylan No Washington Parish Government v. Purdue Pharma						Amneal				
Choctaw County, Alabama 1:19-op-45770 DeGaris Law No 10/28/2022 Mylan No Washington Parish Government v. Purdue Pharma Pharma			_					No		Not named as Defendant to suit.
Washington Parish Government v. Purdue Pharma Amneal Pharmaceuticals of	·	1:19-op-45770	DeGaris Law							
Government v. Purdue Pharma Pharmaceuticals of Pharmaceuticals of	Choctaw County, Alabama	1:19-op-45770	DeGaris Law	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No			
II P et al 1119-on-45773 I eger & Shaw I Yes New York IIC Ves No I Not named as Defendant to suit		1:19-op-45773	Leger & Shaw	Yes		New York, LLC	Yes	No		Not named as Defendant to suit.
En 2 Cede of Sulaw Lea lace of Sulaw Lea Lead of Sulaw Lea Lead Lead Lead Lead Lead Lead Lead	L.I ., CL al.	1.15-υμ-45//3	Legel & Sllaw	163		INGW TOTK, LLC	163	INO		Not named as Defendant to suit.
	=	1:19-op-45773	Leger & Shaw	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023. (Doc. No. 48)

									Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
Ada County, ID	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Ada County, ID	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/17/23. Indivior added on short form. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No response received from Indivior after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Indivior declined waiver 3/16/2023.
Add County, 1D	1.15-0p-45775	Relief Rolli back L.L.F.	163		maivioi	163	163	3/17/2023	r ersonal service perfected 3/13/2023. Individu declined waiver 3/10/2023.
Ada County, Idaho	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Ada County, Idaho	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Ada County, Idaho	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Ada County, Idaho	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Mylan added on short form. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No waiver received after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/13/2023.
City of Wichita, KS	1:19-op-45781	Hutton & Hutton; Bertram & Graf/Edgar Law Firm	Yes	N/A	KVK-Tech	No			The City of Wichita was initially included on KVK-Tech's 1/30/23 deficiency list. However, The City of Witchita was removed from KVK-Tech's amended deficiency list filed on 2/6/23.
city of wichita, its	1.13 00 43701	Hutton & Hutton; Bertram & Graf/Edgar Law Firm; Skikos	Tes	N/A	NVN FEETI	NO .			
City of Wichita, KS	1:19-op-45781	Crawford Skikos & Joseph	Yes	N/A	KVK-Tech	No			The City of Wichita was initially included on KVK-Tech's 1/30/23 deficiency list. However, The City of Witchita was removed from KVK-Tech's amended deficiency list filed on 2/6/23.
City of Prattville, Alabama	1:19-op-45783	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/:	2022 Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Prattville, Alabama	1:19-op-45783	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/:	2022 Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Orango Book Aleks	a 1:10 on 45794	Dilay & Jackson D.C.	No	40/27/	2022 Hikma	Vec	In Drocess	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Orange Beach, Alabama	a [1:19-0p-45/84	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/2//	2022 Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	in process.

									Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time.
									Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this
									defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak,
									and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service
									waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel
		D'I O I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		40/27/2022					then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is
City of Orange Beach, Alabama	1:19-op-45/84	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	ZiMyian	Yes	In Process	In Process	in process.
The Klamath Tribes	1:19-op-45786				Apotex	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
The Riamath Tribes	1.15-0p-45780				Apotex	NO			Enducies only and did not apply to plaintin-tribes (see 0/20/18 Order, #042).
					Associated				The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and
					Pharmacies				fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In
					Inc/American				addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
The Klamath Tribes	1:19-op-45786			Natural Dit	Associated Pharmacies	Yes			Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Klamath Tribes, NJ	1:19-op-45786	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 649	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	12/10/2019	Proof of service at Dkt. 55.
Klamath Tribes, OR v. Purdue	1.13-0p-43780	Weitz & Luxemberg	NO	Not required; Dkt.	Filatiliaceuticai	res	les	12/10/2019	Frooi of service at DKL 33.
,	1:19-op-45786	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	638, Dkt. 644	SuperValu	No			
	1:19-op-45789	LCHB	No	3/15/2023	Morris & Dickson	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 3/14/2023. No response. Praecipe to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Decatur County, Tennessee	1:19-op-45789	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Amneal	No			
Chariton County, MO v.		Levin Papantonio			Pharmacy Buying				
Purdue Pharm L.P. et al	1:19-op-45790	Rafferty	Yes		Association	Yes	Yes	1/3/2020	
The Town of Bennington, Vermont v. Mallinckrodt PLC, et al.	1:19-op-45791	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		On December 6, 2019, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant but did not receive a response. Subdivision counsel recently followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service but still has not received a response. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel will file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
									On December 6, 2019, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant but did not receive a response. Subdivision counsel recently followed up with Defendant and again
The Town of Bennington, Vermont v. Mallinckrodt PLC, et al.	1:19-op-45791	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		requested a waiver of service but still has not received a response. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
The Town of Bennington, Vermont v. Mallinckrodt PLC, et al.	1:19-op-45791	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On December 6, 2019, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant but did not receive a response. Subdivision counsel recently followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service but still has not received a response. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1

	_					
City of Covington, Virginia 1:1	19-op-45799	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Y	/es	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes In Pr	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 [P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly

	T		T		1			
								On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver
								of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
City of Covington, Virginia	1:19-op-45799	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Board of County	1.13 Ομ-43/33		103	i narmaceuticais, ilic.	103	1111100033		apon receipt from bereindand.
Commissioners for Dewey								
County, OK	1:19-op-45801	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Dewey								
County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45801	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of Dewey County, OK	1:19-op-45801	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Dewey County Board of County Commissioners,								
Oklahoma	1:19-op-45801	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
		Bossier & Associates,						Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does
City of Jackson (MS)	1:19-op-45806	PLLC	No	2/14/2023 JM Smith	Yes	No		not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Indian Advisor	1.40 - 45000	Bossier & Associates,	No.	Amneal	W	N-		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does
City of Jackson, Mississippi	1:19-op-45806	PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No		not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Jackson, Mississippi	1:19-op-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Henry Schein	Yes	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
		Bossier & Associates,						Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does
City of Jackson, Mississippi	1:19-op-45806	PLLC	No	2/14/2023 Hikma	No	No		not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Jackson, MS	1:19-op-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023 KVK-Tech	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Twin Falls County, ID	1:10 on 45020	Kaller Postman II C	No	Masters 2/21/2023 Pharmaceutical	Vec	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ₽6c
i will rails Couffly, ID	1:19-op-45828	Keller Postman LLC	No	Masters	Yes	No		Frantin interios to request beiendant waive service pursuant to Civio (Foc
City of Coon Rapids, MN	1:19-op-45835	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023 Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
Loudoun County, Virginia	1:19-op-45842	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No		Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.
Loudoun County, Virginia	1:19-op-45842	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	No		Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.

		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Amneal				Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because
Loudoun County, Virginia	1:19-op-45842	LLP	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No		the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.
City of Auburn v. Purdue	·							
Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Auburn, New York	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Hikma	No			
				Amneal				
The City of Auburn, New York	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Auburn, New York	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Mylan	No	163	2/22/2023	Waiver also sent 2/17/25
			-					
The City of Auburn (New York)	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Henry Schein	No			
The City of Auburn (NY)	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
Lauderdale County, Alabama	1:19-op-45845	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022 Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
Lauderdale County, Alabama	1:19-0p-45845		INO	10/28/2022 HIKIIIa	res	III Process	In Process	in process.
Lauderdale County, Alabama	1:19-op-45845	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022 Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
Greensville County, Virginia	1:19-op-45848	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Greensville County, Virginia	1:19-op-45848	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Greensville County, Virginia	1:19-op-45848	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Culpeper County, Virginia	1:19-op-45849	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Culpeper County, Virginia	1:19-op-45849	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.

Culpeper County, Virginia	1:19-op-45849	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Charlotte County, Virginia	1:19-op-45851	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Charlotte County, Virginia	1:19-op-45851	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D

Defendant would accept service via email in sub cases that had not yet been served or filed. The file the festetive as of the date defendant sent a reply e if defendant did not reply within ten business date that business day following subdivision counsel subdivision counsel subdivision counsel sent Defendant did not respond to that e effective the tenth business day following subdivid calims for the first time that it was not properly according to the parties' agreement. This alone to Defendant has been properly served or at least service. Further, out of an abundance of caution of service on along with the complaint. However of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly down that the defendant and again requested a waiver of court has made clear in its Case Management Of unnecessary expenses associated with serving it the parties' properties to waive service pursus of order No. 1 p 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has no Order No. 1 p 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has no Order No. 2 p 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has no Defendant has	y email acknowledging receipt of service, except that days, service would be deemed effective as of the sel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, laint in this case, in accordance with the parties' at email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was division counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant by served, failing to mention that it was served be constitutes good cause to either find that st grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect on, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver ver, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver y disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid g the summons and, absent good cause, [should suant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
City of Ogdensburg, New York 1:19-op-45852 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/22/2022 Hikma No Mo Indicate the City of Ogdensburg, New York et al. 1:19-op-45852 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/22/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes Yes 2/22/2023 waiver also sent 2/17/23	
TORK et al. 1:19-0p-45852 Napoli Srikolnik No 12/22/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes Yes 2/22/2025 Walver also sent 2/17/25	
City of Ogdensburg, New York 1:19-op-45852 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/22/2022 Mylan No	
The City of Ogdensburg (NY) 1:19-op-45852 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/22/2022 JM Smith Yes Yes 2/15/2023	
The City of Ogdensburg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. 1:19-op-45852 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/22/2022 Value Drug Yes Yes 2/15/2023	
City of Rochester, New York 1:19-op-45853 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/22/2022 Hikma No	
The City of Rochester, New Amneal	
York 1:19-op-45853 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/22/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes Yes 2/22/2023 waiver also sent 2/17/23	
City of Rochester, New York 1:19-op-45853 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/22/2022 Mylan No	
The City of Rochester (NY) 1:19-op-45853 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/22/2022 JM Smith Yes Yes 2/15/2023	
The City of Rochester v.	
Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. 1:19-op-45853 Napoli Shkolnik No 12/22/2022 Value Drug Yes Yes 2/15/2023 Scott+Scott Attorneys at Scott+Scott Attorneys at Scott+Scott Attorneys at Scott-Scott Scott-Scot	
City of Portsmouth, Virginia 1:19-op-45856 Law LLP Yes Hikma Yes	
City of Saratoga Springs, New	
York 1:19-op-45857 Napoli Shkolnik No 1/3/2023 Hikma No Image: No <td></td>	
The City of Saratoga Springs, Amneal	
New York 1:19-op-45857 Napoli Shkolnik No 1/3/2023 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes Yes 2/22/2023 waiver also sent 2/17/23	
City of Saratoga Springs, New York 1:19-op-45857 Napoli Shkolnik No 1/3/2023 Mylan No	
The City of Saratoga Springs	
The City of Saratoga Springs v.	
Purdue Pharma L.P., et al 1:19-op-45857 Napoli Shkolnik No 1/3/2023 Value Drug Yes Yes 2/15/2023	
The City of Saratoga Springs, NY 1:19-op-45857 Napoli Shkolnik No 1/3/2023 Sandoz/Novartis No	
1:19-op-45857 Napoli Srikolink No	

County of Kauai, political								
subdivision of the State of								
Hawaii, for themselves								
individually, and on behalf of								
all similarly situated persons,				Amneal				
et al.	1:19-op-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022 Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Ves	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
County of Kauai v. CVS Health	1.13-0p-43802	Napoli Silkolilik	NO	12/13/2022 Maimaceuticais, inc.	163	163	2/22/2023	waiver also selft 2/11/25
•	1.10 15062	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/12/2022 Value Drug	Voc	Vec	2/45/2022	
Corporation, et al.	1:19-op-45862	марон эпконик	No	12/13/2022 Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
County of Kaua'i, a Political								
Subdivision of the State of								
Hawai'i, for themselves								
individually, and on behalf of								
all similarly situated persons,								
and on behalf of the general								
public, as a class (Hawaii)[1]	1:19-op-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022 Henry Schein	No			
County of Kaua'i, Hawaii	1:19-op-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022 Hikma	No			
County of Kauai, Hawaii	1:19-op-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022 Mylan	No			
The Fiscal Court of Casey				Amneal	-			
-	1:19-op-45887	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Fiscal Court of Lewis County	1.13 OP 43007	THE THIRE IT IIII	163	That maceuticals EEC	163	1.63	2/10/2023	
(KY)	1.10 an 45000	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Voc	Yes	2/16/2023	
	1:19-op-45889 1:19-op-45894			12/22/2022 Hikma		ies	2/10/2023	
		Napoli Shkolnik	No		No			
Okaloosa County, Florida	1:19-op-45894	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Mylan	No			
								On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that
								Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
								cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
								effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
								if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
								tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint,
								subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties'
								agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was
								effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant
								claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served
								according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that
								Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect
								service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver
								of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver
								of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up
								with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this
								court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid
								unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should
								have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
		Camfand Haidan Ch		A				Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to
67	4.40 45000	Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Amneal				return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly
City of Fredericksburg, Virginia	1:19-0p-45898	LLP	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	res	In Process	1	upon receipt from Defendant.

					1			1	T
City of Fredericksburg, Virginia	1:19-op-45898	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
City of Fredericksburg, Virginia	1:19-op-45898	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 [* 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from
City of Sylacauga, Alabama	1:19-op-45900	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.

	1			T				
City of Sylacauga, Alabama	1:19-op-45900	Riley & Jackson, P.C. No	10/27/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
								Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
City of Vancouver, WA	1:19-op-45908	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023.
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	1:19-op-45923	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
The Board of County				A				Deplementary of Complete and Application of the deplement
Commissioners of the County of Mesa, Colorado	1:19-op-45923	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
The Board of County	1.13 00 13323	Keller Hollinderk E.E.I Tes		That maccaticals EEC	103	163	371472023	The manage follow ups, marker refused to sign waiver. I ersonal service perfected 5/10/2015.
Commissioners of the County				Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
of Mesa, Colorado	1:19-op-45923	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Taurahia af Dauranat NII	4.40	The Maintain Law Since LLC No.	2/20/2022	American Sales	V	In Dunner		
Township of Barnegat, NJ	1:19-op-45925	The Wright Law Firm, LLC No	2/20/2023	Company, LLC	Yes	In Process		
Township of Barnegat, NJ	1:19-OP-45925	The Wright Law Firm, LLC No	2/20/2023	TopRx	Yes	In Process		
Township of Barnegat, NJ Police Department	1:19-op-45925	The Wright Law Firm, LLC No	2/20/2023	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		
Prince George County, Virginia	1:19-op-45929	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Prince George County, Virginia	1:19-op-45929	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Prince George County, Virginia	1:19-on-45929	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
ice deorge county, virginia	2.15 Op 45525		1/17/2020 &	a.maccancais, inc.		103	2,27,2023	Terrer and this case should not be distributed.
, , ,	1:19-op-45934	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC Yes	12/11/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
The City of Pascagoula,	1.10 - 7 45024	Daniel & Markovita DIIC Van	1/17/2020 &	A	N-			
Mississippi	1:19-op-45934	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC Yes	12/11/2022	Amneal	No			Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is
City of Huntsville, Alabama	1:19-op-45947	Riley & Jackson, P.C. No	10/27/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	in process.

	1				T	1			
									Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is
City of Huntsville, Alabama	1:19-op-45947	Riley & Jackson, P.C. Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	2 Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	in process.
City of Athens, Alabama	1:19-op-45953	Kiley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022) Hikma	No			
ercy er menensy masuma	2123 Op 18888	Riley & Jackson, P.C.		10/27/2022					
City of Athens, Alabama	1:19-op-45953		No		Mylan	No			
The Fiscal Court of Grant	1.10 45061	The Siege II Siege	V		INA Consists	V	V	2/46/2022	
County (KY) The Fiscal Court of Grant	1:19-op-45961	The Finnell Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
County, Kentucky v. Teva									
Pharmaceutical Industries,					Amneal				
Ltd., et al.	1:19-op-45961	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Lincoln County, Washington v.					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Richard S. Sackler, et al.	1:19-op-45962	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
	·								
Lincoln County, Washington v.					Amneal			0.14.4.10.000	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
Richard S. Sackler, et al.	1:19-op-45962	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of Homewood, Alabama	1:19-op-45973	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	2 Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Homewood, Alabama	1:19-op-45973	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	2 Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
									Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver
City of Greeley, CO	1:19-op-45977	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	signed and returned 3/8/2023.
					Amneal				Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020.
City of Greeley, Colorado	1:19-op-45977	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of Greeley, Colorado	1:19-op-45977	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of dreeley, colorado	1.15-0β-45577	Keller Kolli back L.L.F.	163		r narmaceuticais, inc.	163	163	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
City of Bainbridge Island,									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
Washington	1:19-op-45981	Keller Rohrback L.L.P. Simon Greenstone	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
County of Freestone, Texas	1:19-op-45985	Panatier, P.C.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 10/24/2019.
Board of County		<u> </u>			,				
Commissioners of Woods							<u> </u>		
County, OK Board of County	1:19-op-45987	Fulmer Sill	Yes	+	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Commissioners of Woods									
County, OK	1:19-op-45987	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	

-	1				1			
,	1:19-op-45987	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:19-op-45987	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Pottawatomie								
County, OK	1:19-op-45988	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Pottawatomie County Board of								
Commissioners, OK	1:19-op-45988	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Pottawatomie County Board of								
County Commissioners,								
Oklahoma	1:19-op-45988	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Pottawatomie County Board of								
County Commissioners,								
	1:19-op-45988	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County	ı			·				
Commissioners of Kay County,								
	1:19-op-45989	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:19-op-45989	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Bocc of Ray County, OK	1.13-0p-43383	Tullici Sili	103	Germanna	103	103	3/10/2023	
Kay County Board of County								
1 -	1:10 on 45000	Eulmor Sill	Vos	Lilma	Voc	Voc	2/20/2022	
	1:19-op-45989	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
	1:19-op-45989	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Major								
	1:19-op-45990	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Major								
	1:19-op-45990	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Major County, OK	1:19-op-45990	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/2/2021	
Warren County (VA)	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/2/2021	
Westmoreland County (VA)	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/2/2021	
				Amneal				
Westmoreland County,				Pharmaceuticals of				
Virginia, et al.	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes	New York, LLC	Yes	No		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC was not named as a Defendant in this case
Westmoreland County,	·			Amneal				
Virginia, et al.	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	4/2/2021	
- J	F						, , ,	
Westmoreland County,				Amneal				
Virginia, et al.	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
angina, at an			1.00				-,,	
Westmoreland County VA et al.	1·19-on-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	4/2/2021	
Westinoreland County VA et al.	1.15-0p-45555	THE THINEH THIN	163	KVK-TECH	163	163	4/2/2021	
								As demonstrated below, in a good faith attempt to correct the deficiency, a Waiver has been sent
								to KVK-Tech for signature. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, P6c, Service of
								Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated
								with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant
								to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no
								prejudice to Defendant KVK-Tech by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.
								KVK-Tech, Inc. – listed as no service of process. (Doc Nos.
								4848 and 4876) •On
		Brindisi, Murad &						February 10, 2023, a Waiver of Service of Summons along with a copy of the complaint was sent to
West Pittston, PA	1:19-op-45997	Brindisi Pearlman	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		Attorney Thomas E. Rice. Inc. – listed as no service of process. (Doc Nos. 4848 and 4876)
								Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this
								case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of
								submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time.
								Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this
								defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak,
								and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service
								waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel
								then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is
City of Lynn Haven, Florida	1:19-op-46006	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	in process.
City of Lynn Haven, Florida	1:19-op-46006	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	Mylan	No			
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-	-,		Masters				
City of North St. Paul, MN	1:19-op-46066	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023 Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
.,		1	1 -	, ,	1	1 -	1	

	T		1	T	1	T			
		Weisbrod Matteis &							
Atlantic County, New Jersey	1:19-op-46071	Copley PLLC, Cooper Levenson	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
Atlantic County, New Jersey	1.15-0p-40071	Weisbrod Matteis &	163		HIKHIG	163	III FIOCESS		Submitted Complaint as FF3 prior to 10/14/2022
		Copley PLLC, Cooper							
Atlantic County, New Jersey	1:19-op-46071	Levenson	Yes		Mylan	No			Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
		Weisbrod Matteis &			·				
		Copley PLLC, Cooper			Amneal				
Atlantic County, New Jersey	1:19-op-46071	Levenson	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	4/12/2019	Defendant Waiver of Service, Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
		Weisbrod Matteis &							
		Copley PLLC, Cooper							
Atlantic County, NJ	1:19-op-46071	Levenson	Yes		Indivior	No			Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
		Weisbrod Matteis &							
Atlantic County, NJ	1.10 on 40071	Copley PLLC, Cooper	Yes		KVK-Tech	Voc	Voc	4/25/2018	Defendant Waiver of Service, Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
Atlantic County, NJ	1:19-op-46071	Levenson Levin Papantonio	res		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	4/25/2018	Defendant waiver of Service, Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
City of New Port Richey (FL)	1:19-op-46073	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
city of New Fort Melley (FE)	1.15-0p-40073	Rancity	163		JIVI SIIIICII	103	103	12/30/2020	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a
									named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request
									originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups.
City of Spokane, Washington	1:19-op-46092	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Buffalo (NY)	1:19-op-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Buffalo v. Purdue									
Pharma LP, et al.	1:19-op-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
	1:19-op-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022		No			
City of Buffalo, New York	1:19-op-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of B. Mills No. 1		No. of Children	la.	42/42/2022					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1:19-op-46104 1:19-op-46115	Napoli Shkolnik LCHB	No No	12/13/2022 3/14/2023		No	Yes	4/23/2020	Waiver of service filed on docket 3/3/2023.
Obion County (TN)	1:19-0p-46115	LCHB	INO	3/14/2023	Amneal	Yes	res	4/23/2020	Waiver sent 4/15/2020 but not returned. Defendants replied that they will not waive service.
Obion County, Tennessee	1:19-op-46115	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Praecipe to obtain summons filed on 3/20/2023.
Obioii County, Termessee	1.15-0p-40113	LCTID	110	3/14/2023	Filanniaceuticais EEC	163	III F TOCESS		Praecipe to obtain summons med on 3/20/2023.
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
City of Haleyville, AL	1:19-op-46118	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	4/14/2020	
									Winn Dixie's filing Notice filed on 1/30/23 (Doc 4846) has case # 1:19-op-45272 incorrectly listed
		Levin Papantonio							for Ormond. Case # 1:19-op-45272 is Marion County FL. Ormond Beach case # is correct on the
The City of Ormond Beach (FL)	1:19-op-46121	Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/15/2020	sheet
-1 00 10 15 1750		Levin Papantonio					.,	10/00/0000	
The City of Ormond Beach (FL)	1:19-op-46121	Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
					Associated				
					Associated Pharmacies				
		Levin Papantonio			Inc/American				
City of Brookhaven, MS	1:19-op-46143	Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	4/14/2020	
City of Bethany, OK	1:19-op-46148	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
, , , , ,								-, -, -	
									Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed
									waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court
									on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal				Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed
Patrick County, Virginia	1:19-op-46149	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
									Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed
					Amnoal				waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal Pharmaceuticals of				on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed
Patrick County, Virginia	1:19-op-46149	LLP	Yes		New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
r actick country, virginia	1.13-0p-40143	LLF	162		INCW TOIN, LLC	163	163	2/24/2023	שמועכו מווע נוווג נמגב גווטעוע ווטג שב עוגווווגגבע.
									Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed
									waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court
									on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal				Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed
Patrick County, Virginia	1:19-op-46149	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
ratrick County, Virginia	1.19-υρ-4 0 149	ITTL	res	1	rnarmaceuticals, Inc.	res	res	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.

	1				_		•		
Shenandoah County, Virginia	1:19-op-46150	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Chanandagh County Virginia	1.10 on 40150	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Vos		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Vos	Voc	2/24/2022	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Shenandoah County, Virginia	1:19-op-46150	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes		Amneal	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed
Shenandoah County, Virginia	1:19-op-46150	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Allegany County, New York	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
				0.40.40.00					
Allegany County (New York) Allegany County v. Purdue	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Henry Schein	No			
Pharma LP, et al	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
Allegany County, New York	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023		No	163	2/15/2025	
Allegany County, New York	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023		Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Allegany County, NY	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No		Sandoz/Novartis	No	1.00	2, 20, 2020	
County of Allegany (NY)	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
The City of Waynesboro, Virginia	1:19-op-46152	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
The City of Waynesboro, Virginia	1:19-op-46152	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
The City of Waynesboro, Virginia	1:19-op-46152	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.

On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of ser Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that serv effective as of the date defendant permit and the parties for the service of if defendant did not reply within ten business day assure would give receipt of if defendant did not reply within ten business days, asknowledge her celept of tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing subdivision counsels email within 90 days of filing subdivision counsels ento tenth email, so, under the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreeffective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, yes daims for the first time that it was the thin that it according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to eithe Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additis service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent. The other countries are the subdivision counsel and the parties' agreement. However, Defendant did not return an effective that the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an effective that the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an effective that the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an effective that the complaint
Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that serv effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of if defending the total floor reply within ten business days green and if the did not reply within ten business days following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement in the total time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it according to the parties' agreement. This rate that it was not properly served post cause to either Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional post countries. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent to the parties' agreement. The parties of the parties' agreement. The parties of the parties' agreement. The parties of the parties' agreement. The parties of the
Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that serv effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of s if deedned into reply within ten business days, receipt of s if deedned into the parties of the parties of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance wi agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement. This under the parties' agreement agreement of the parties' agreement according to the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement according to the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement according to the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement according to the parties' agreement. This long to mention the diamond of the parties' agreement according to the parties' agreement. This long to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement according to the parties agreement a
of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision couwith Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good of have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Comberland County, Virginia 1:19-op-46153 LLP Yes In Process upon receipt from Defendant.
On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of ser Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that serv effective as of the date defendants ent a reply email receipt of service of it defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed et tenth business days following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing subdivision counsels sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to eithe dating for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to eithe Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel addition and the service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel addition service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also settle of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an experience of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an experience of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an experience of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an experience of service of form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, but sevendant has not court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has not court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has not court has made clear in its Case Management of Order, Defendant has not court has made clear in its Case Management of Order, Defendant has not court has made clear in its Case Management of Order, Defendant has not court has made clear in its Case Management of Order, Defendant ha
Amneal Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause fo Sanford Heisler Sharp, Pharmaceuticals of return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the execute

	1	1			1	,			
									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that
									Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
									cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
									effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
									if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
									tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint,
									subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was
									effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant
									claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served
									according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that
									Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect
									service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver
									of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver
									of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up
									with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid
									unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should
									have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
									Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to
	4.40 46452	Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal	W	l. B.		return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly
Cumberland County, Virginia	1:19-op-46153	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		upon receipt from Defendant.
									Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed
									waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal				on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed
City of Radford, Virginia	1:19-op-46154	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
, , ,								, ,	
									Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed
					Amneal				waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Pharmaceuticals of				on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed
City of Radford, Virginia	1:19-op-46154	LLP	Yes		New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
									Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court
									on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			Amneal				Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed
City of Radford, Virginia	1:19-op-46154	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
City of Shawnee, OK	1:19-op-46155	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Caddo									
County, OK	1:19-op-46156	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County									
Commissioners of Caddo									
County, OK	1:19-op-46156	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Caddo County, OK Caddo County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-46156 1:19-op-46156	Fulmer Sill Fulmer Sill	Yes Yes		Mylan	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	3/16/2023 3/16/2023	
City of Amsterdam (NY)	1:19-op-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022		Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Amsterdam v. Purdue	·			•				·	
Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Amsterdam, New York	1:19-op-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Amsterdam, New									
York The City of Amsterdam New	1:19-op-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Amneal	No			
The City of Amsterdam, New York	1:19-op-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
The City of Poughkeepsie, New	2.10 Op 40102	. Tapon Silkolilik		12,22,2022		1.10			
York, individually, and on									
behalf of all others similarly-					Amneal				
situated	1:19-op-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23

City of Poughkeepsie v. Purdue								
Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
				10 (00 (000) 111	.,		0 /4 4 /0 000	
City of Poughkeepsie, New York	1:19-op-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Poughkeepsie, New York	1·19-on-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Mylan	No			
only of a degrine epoint, then form	1.15 op .0105	Traper or morning	1.0	12/22/2022 Myon				
The City of Poughkeepsie (NY)	1:19-op-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
East Baton Rouge Parish Clerk								
•	1:19-op-46164	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023 Mylan	No			
Board of County Commissioners of Grady								
·	1:19-op-46167	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County	1.15 op 40107	r diffici Sili	103	indivior	103	103	3/10/2023	
Commissioners of Grady								
County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-46167	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Grady								
	1:19-op-46167	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Grady County, OK	1:19-op-46167	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma Masters	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Clark County, NV	1:19-op-46168	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes	Pharmaceutical	No	Yes	N/A	Defendant error alleging untimely PFS upload.
Board of County	1.19-0p-40108	Railerty	ies	Filatiliaceutical	INO	ies	IN/A	Defendant error alleging untilinery FFS upload.
Commissioners of Jefferson								
County, OK	1:19-op-46170	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Jefferson								
County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-46170	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of Jefferson County, OK	1:19-op-46170	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:19-op-46174	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Amneal	No	ies	3/10/2023	
Borough of Edwardsville,	1.15 ор чот/ч	Trupon Sinconnic	110	12/22/2022 / 11111001	110			
Pennsylvania v.								
AmerisourceBergen Drug		Levin Papantonio						
	1:19-op-46176	Rafferty	Yes	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/2/2020	
Forty Fort Borough,								
Pennsylvania v.		Lauia Danantania						
AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.	1:19-op-46177	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes	Value Drug	Voc	Yes	4/3/2020	
corporation, et al.	1.19-0p-46177	Namerty	res	Masters	Yes	ies	4/3/2020	
City of Marinette, WI	1:19-op-46181	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023 Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO P6c
	1:19-op-46183	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022 KVK-Tech	No			
	1:19-op-46183	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022 Hikma	No			
	1:19-op-46183	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022 Mylan	No			
City of Pontiac, Michigan	1:19-op-46183	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022 Amneal	No			
		No. of Children		Amneal		v.	0 /00 /	1 2 4 7 4 7 4 7 4 7 4 7 4 7 4 7 4 7 4 7 4
	1:19-op-46184	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022 Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
	1:19-op-46184 1:19-op-46184	Napoli Shkolnik Napoli Shkolnik	No No	12/14/2022 Hikma 12/14/2022 Mylan	No No			
	1:19-op-46184	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022 KVK-Tech	No			
Edwichec County, Ki	1.15 op 40104	14apon Shkomik	110	12/14/2022 RVR TCCII	140			
								Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed
								waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court
					1			on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Amneal	1			Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed
City of Emporia, Virginia	1:19-op-46850	LLP	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
					1			Makin 00 days of filling the consult of the filling the filling the consult of the filling the consult
					1			Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court
				Amneal	1			on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Pharmaceuticals of	1			Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed
City of Emporia, Virginia	1:19-op-46850	LLP	Yes	New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
			•			1 -	, ,	

-	T	1			T	1	1		1
City of Emparie Vissinia	1.10 16050	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Voc		Amneal	Vec	Ves	2/24/2022	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
City of Emporia, Virginia	1:19-op-46850	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.		Yes	2/24/2023	waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
McDonald County (MO)	1:20- op-45225	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		JM Smith	No		- / /	
City of Toledo, OH	1:2017op45005	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Sunflower County, MS	1:2018op45020	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
Washington County, MS	1:2018op45022	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
County of Lake, OH	1:2018op45032	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Claiborne County, MS	1:2018op45035	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
City of Lansing, MI	1:2018op45054	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
					Sandoz International				
City of Lansing, MI	1:2018op45054	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Delta, MI	1:2018op45067	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
					Sandoz International				
County of Delta, MI	1:2018op45067	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of Escanaba, MI	1:2018op45068	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
					Sandoz International				
City of Escanaba, MI	1:2018op45068	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Saginaw, MI	1:2018op45082	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
					Sandoz International				
County of Saginaw, MI	1:2018op45082	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Marquette, MI	1:2018op45104	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
	'	, and the second			Sandoz International				
County of Marquette, MI	1:2018op45104	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Leelanau, MI	1:2018op45111	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
				1,12	Sandoz International				
County of Leelanau, MI	1:2018op45111	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
		Blasingame, Burch,					1		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Candler County, GA	1:2018op45165	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
candler county, an	1.20100p+3103	Skikos Crawford Skikos	110	12/13/2022	NOVUITIS AG	103	110		corporation is suspended until further order of the court. (boc. 252).
		& Joseph			Sandoz International				A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz
County of Huerfano, CO	1:2018op45168	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	International GmbH on 2/17/23.
County of fiderialio, co	1.20100p43100	Skikos Crawford Skikos	163	IN/A	GIIIDII	163	NO	IN/ A	international official of 2/17/23.
		& Joseph							A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz Inc.
County of Huerfano, CO	1:2018op45168	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	No	NI/A	on 2/17/23.
County of Ademand, CO	1:20180p45168	OCIIS Law FIIIII	res	IN/A	Sandoz inc.	163	INO	N/A	011 2/17/25.
									PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
Marion County, AL, et al.	1:2018op45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Marion County, AL, et al. Talladega County, AL	1:2018op45171 1:2018op45190	•	No Yes	3/3/2023	Sandoz Inc. Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process Yes	3/23/2023	
		Zulanas, P.C. Montgomery Ponder,			Sandoz Inc.			3/23/2023	before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order. Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc.
Talladega County, AL	1:2018op45190 1:2018op45216	Zulanas, P.C. Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023	before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order. Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc. 39] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 41].
Talladega County, AL Town of Butler, AL	1:2018op45190 1:2018op45216	Zulanas, P.C. Montgomery Ponder, LLC Frazer PLC	Yes	1/10/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023	Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc. 39] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 41]. Waiver of Service Requested; No Response
Talladega County, AL Town of Butler, AL Unified Government of Athens-	1:2018op45190 1:2018op45216	Zulanas, P.C. Montgomery Ponder, LLC Frazer PLC Blasingame, Burch,	Yes No	1/10/2023	Sandoz Inc. Sandoz Inc.	Yes Yes	Yes In Process	3/23/2023	before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order. Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc. 39] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 41]. Waiver of Service Requested; No Response Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign

									PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these
									pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on
									3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted
									Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the
									folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on
									3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format
									of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one
									pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the
									PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
		Friedman, Dazzio &							reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
Marshall County, AL, et al.	1:2018op45230	Zulanas, P.C.	No	2/2/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Voc	In Process		before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
iviaisiiaii County, AL, et ai.	1.20160µ45250	_ ·	INU	3/3/2023	Saliuoz IIIC.	Yes	III Process		, , ,
1.55	4 2040 45227	Blasingame, Burch,		42/44/2022	N	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \			Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Jeff Davis County, GA	1:2018op45237	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Crisp County, GA	1:2018op45238	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
									Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form
									for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's
									counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney
		Montgomery Ponder,							for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc.
Clay County, AL	1:2018op45248	LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023	38] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 40].
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Sumter County, GA	1:2018op45250	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Oglethorpe County, GA	1:2018op45262	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Rome, GA, et al.*	1:2018op45282	The Finnell Firm	Yes	12/11/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	corporation is suspended with the order of the court (500-202).
erry or nome, and er an	1.201000713202	Blasingame, Burch,	103		Suridoz IIIc.	163	103	2/10/2023	Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Irwin County, GA	1:2018op45283	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
ii wiii county, GA	1.20160p43263	Garrard & Asiliey, F.C.	INO	12/14/2022	NOVALUS AG	163	INO		corporation is suspended diffin further order of the court. (Doc. 232).
									Sandoz, Inc. has not alleged a service defect. However, Novartis AG has alleged a service defect.
		Diagina and a Divisib							=
	4 2040 45202	Blasingame, Burch,		42/44/2022	Contraction	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \			Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Irwin County, GA	1:2018op45283	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Cook County, GA	1:2018op45284	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Hall County, GA	1:2018op45286	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Madison County, GA	1:2018op45296	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Walton County GA	1:2018op45297	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Gautreaux (Sheriff of East		Simmons Hanly Conroy,	,						
Baton Rouge Parish), LA	1:2018op45325	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
	·	Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Decatur County, GA	1:2018op45334	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
County of Gratiot, MI	1:2018op45339	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
,			-		Sandoz International		-		
County of Gratiot, MI	1:2018op45339	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alcona, MI	1:2018op45340	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alcona, Wil	1.20180p43340	Weitz & Luxeliberg	110	12/1/2022	Sandoz International	103	110		Screed Sandoz, mc.
County of Alcono MI	1.201015210	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		Vas	No		Conved Conder Inc
County of Alcona, MI	1:2018op45340		No			Yes	No No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Arenac, MI	1:2018op45341	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
				10/1/0000	Sandoz International	l.,			
County of Arenac, MI	1:2018op45341	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Dickinson, MI	1:2018op45342	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
					Sandoz International				
County of Dickinson, MI	1:2018op45342	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of Iron Mountain, MI	1:2018op45344	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
•		i i		1	Sandoz International				
,						1	1	i	,
	1:2018op45344	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022		Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
	1:2018op45344 1:2018op45348	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No No		GmbH Novartis AG	Yes Yes	No No		Served Sandoz, Inc. Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of Iron Mountain, MI County of Ogemaw, MI	· ·								
	· ·				Novartis AG Sandoz International				

	T				-		
				Sandoz International			
County of Isabella, MI	1:2018op45349	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Shiawassee, MI	1:2018op45350	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
				Sandoz International			
County of Shiawassee, MI	1:2018op45350	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Lenawee, MI	1:2018op45351	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
				Sandoz International			
County of Lenawee, MI	1:2018op45351	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Sanilac, MI	1:2018op45352	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
				Sandoz International			
County of Sanilac, MI	1:2018op45352	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
				Sandoz International			
County of Antrim, MI	1:2018op45354	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Antrm, MI	1:2018op45354	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Benzie, MI	1:2018op45356	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
	'			Sandoz International			
County of Benzie, MI	1:2018op45356	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Osceola, MI	1:2018op45357	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
	2.202000 .0007	Treate a Eavenberg		Sandoz International			55.150 56.150 56.150 56.150
County of Osceola, MI	1:2018op45357	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Oceana, MI	1:20180p45357	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH 12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
Country of Oceana, IVII	1.20100p43333	AACITY OF FRYCHINGIR	INU	Sandoz International	163	1100	Jerveu Januuz, me.
County of Occopy MI	1,20100045250	Maita 8 Luyanbara	No		Vos	No	Conved Conden Inc
County of Oceana, MI County of Alger, MI	1:2018op45359 1:2018op45360	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No No	12/1/2022 GmbH 12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alger, MI	1:20180p45360	weitz & Luxenberg	NO	· · ·	res	INO	Served Sandoz, Inc.
		W. 1. O. I I		Sandoz International			S. 15 1 1
County of Alger, MI	1:2018op45360	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Luce, MI	1:2018op45362	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
				Sandoz International			
County of Luce, MI	1:2018op45362	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Lake, MI	1:2018op45366	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
				Sandoz International			
County of Lake, MI	1:2018op45366	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
		Blasingame, Burch,					Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Banks County, GA	1:2018op45378	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,					Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Twiggs County, GA	1:2018op45379	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,					Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Elbert County, GA	1:2018op45381	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,					Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
City of Bainbridge, GA	1:2018op45383	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
							Sandoz, Inc. has not alleged a service defect. However, Novartis AG has alleged a service defect.
		Blasingame, Burch,					Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
City of Bainbridge, GA	1:2018op45383	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Sandoz/Novartis	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
,	·	Blasingame, Burch,					Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Bulloch County, GA	1:2018op45394	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Grand Rapids, MI	1:2018op45406	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
		Ĭ		Sandoz International			
City of Grand Rapids, MI	1:2018op45406	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No	Served Sandoz, Inc.
Unified Government of Macon		Blasingame, Burch,	-	, -,			Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Bibb County, GA	1:2018op45407	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,	1	11, 11, 1511 11010101010	1.35		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Jones County, GA	1:2018op45424	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
solies edulity, dr	1.20100p4J424	Blasingame, Burch,	1.10	12/17/2022 NOVAILIS AO	103	110	Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Warren County, GA	1:2018op45425	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Pocahontas County	1.20100h43452	Januara & Asilicy, F.C.	140	12/ 14/ 2022 NOVAI (15 AG	103	1100	corporation is suspended until further order of the court. (Doc. 232).
	1.2010 45 442	China or Law Flyns		Conden/Nevertic	No		Dismissed 02/29/2022
Commission, WV	1:2018op45443	Skinner Law Firm		Sandoz/Novartis	No		Dismissed 02/28/2023 Plaintiff did not some Nevertis AC hosping CMO 1. ¶ 6 d, states that "Islamise on a foreign
City of Tift CA	1.2010 45 45 4	Blasingame, Burch,	N/ -	42/44/2022	Ve-	N	Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
City of Tifton, GA	1:2018op45454	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
a		Blasingame, Burch,		,,,,	1.,	<u> </u>	Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
City of Gainesville, GA	1:2018op45486	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,					Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Butts County, GA	1:2018op45490	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,					Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Dougherty County, GA	1:2018op45491	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).

					ı			
City of Maille I and I and Ca	4 2040 . 45 405	Blasingame, Burch,		42/44/2022 N		N.		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
City of Milledgeville, GA	1:2018op45495	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,		10/11/2000	.,			Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Jasper County, GA	1:2018op45504	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,		10/10/2020	.,			Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Ben Hill County, GA	1:2018op45505	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No	- / /	corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
County of Wilcox, GA	1:2018op45506	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
		Blasingame, Burch,		1/1/2020	.,			Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Lincoln County, GA	1:2018op45508	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	1/4/2023 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
McDuffie County, GA	1:2018op45509	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Hancock County, GA	1:2018op45535	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Habersham County, GA	1:2018op45559	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Taliaferro County, GA	1:2018op45562	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Washington County, GA	1:2018op45563	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Tattnall County, GA	1:2018op45574	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Toombs County, GA	1:2018op45576	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Macon County, GA	1:2018op45577	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Newton County, GA	1:2018op45578	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Schley County, GA	1:2018op45580	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Jackson County, GA	1:2018op45581	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
County of Ballard, KY	1:2018op45593	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
City of Harrisburg, IL	1:2018op45594	Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Brysc Phillips Grossman, LLC		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
		Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryso						
City of Princeton, IL	1:2018op45599	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Worth County, GA	1:2018op45602	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
City of Fitzgerald, GA	1:2018op45603	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Sandoz, Inc. has not alleged a service defect. However, Novartis AG has alleged a service defect. Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
City of Fitzgerald, GA	1:2018op45603	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Sandoz/Novartis	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Columbia County, GA	1:2018op45607	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
								PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native formation of the property
		Friedman Dazzio 9						of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants.
Jackson County Al. et al.	1:20190045524	Friedman, Dazzio &	No	2/2/2022 Sandaz Inc	Vec	In Process		pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
Jackson County, AL, et al.	1:2018op45634	Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
						1	1	1.6
Jackson County, AL, et al.	1:2018op45634	· ·	No	3/3/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants

	T	Distance Design	1			1	1		
Charlton County, GA	1:2018op45713	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/12/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Charlon County, GA	1.20180p45715	Blasingame, Burch,	INO	12/13/2022	NOVALUS AG	res	INO		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Brantley County, GA	1:2018op45714	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
, ,	·	Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Troup County, GA	1:2018op45715	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Johnson County, GA	1:2018op45716	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Camden County, GA	1:2018op45717	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
									Summons were issued by the Clerk on or around May 16, 2019. Service of process on Sandoz, Inc.'s registered agent for service of process in New Jersey (state of incorporation/registered office) was effected on May 28, 2019. Excuted Proof of Service dated June 3, 2019 was filed into the docket on June 13, 2019 (1:18-op-45731; R. Doc. 20).
									PFS was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022.
		Neblett, Beard &							Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS
Municipality of Yabucoa, PR*	1:2018op45731	Arsenault	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	5/20/2019	repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							
Mantana Causta KC	4 2040 . 45700	Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	V	N1 / A	Sandoz International	V	N	21/2	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Montgomery County, KS	1:2018op45780	Skikos Crawford Skikos	Yes	N/A	GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	International GmbH on 2/17/23.
		& Joseph							
		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Sandoz International				A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz
Bourbon County, KS	1:2018op45781	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Town of Munford, AL	1:2018op45785	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023	Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc. 40] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 42].
City of Lincoln, AL	1:2018op45786	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023	Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc. 43] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 45].
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
Nodaway County, MO	1:2018op45795	& Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell			Sandoz International				A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz
Atchison County, MO	1:2018op45797	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	International GmbH on 2/17/23.
,, -		Skikos Crawford Skikos						,	
		& Joseph							
		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Sandoz International				A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz
Lafayette County, MO	1:2018op45840	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	International GmbH on 2/17/23.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz Inc. on
Harvey County, KS	1:2018op45848	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	2/17/23.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos			Candan Later of the Control of the C				
Harvoy County VC	1.2019 45040	& Joseph	Voc	N/A	Sandoz International	Voc	No	NI/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz
Harvey County, KS	1:2018op45848	Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	International GmbH on 2/17/23.
		Robbins Geller Rudman							Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Novartis AG, Sandoz International GmbH, and Sandoz Inc. On April 11, 2019, they served the domestic entity – Sandoz Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. <i>See</i> Dkt. No. 27. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Novartis AG to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiffs also served Novartis AG care of Sandoz Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Novartis has been on notice since April 11, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Novartis
Harford County, MD	1:2018op45853	& Dowd LLP	Yes		Novartis AG	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	AG have been effectively cured.

	ı	1	T			T	1	1	
									Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Novartis AG, Sandoz International GmbH, and Sandoz Inc. OnApril 11, 2019, they served the domestic entity – Sandoz Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. <i>See</i> Dkt. No. 27. CMO 1 suspended service of
									international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Sandoz International GmbH to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiffs also
									served Sandoz International GmbH care of Sandoz Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Sandoz has
		Robbins Geller Rudman			Sandoz International				been on notice since April 11, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural
Harford County, MD, et al	1:2018op45853	& Dowd LLP	Yes		GmbH	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	service issues related to Sandoz International GmbH have been effectively cured.
County of Montcalm, MI	1:2018op45865	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 Novartis AG Sandoz International	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Montcalm, MI	1:2018op45865	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Houghton, MI	1:2018op45866	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
					Sandoz International				
County of Houghton, MI County of Tuscola, MI	1:2018op45866 1:2018op45870	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No No		12/1/2022 GmbH 12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes Yes	No No		Served Sandoz, Inc. Served Sandoz, Inc.
Country of Tuscola, Wil	1.20100p+3070	Weitz & Editerioerg	140		Sandoz International	163	110		Served surface, me.
County of Tuscola, MI	1:2018op45870	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alpena, MI	1:2018op45871	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alpena, MI	1:2018op45871	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Sandoz International 12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Washtenaw, MI	1:20180p45871	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 GHIBH 12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
	·				Sandoz International				
County of Washtenaw, MI	1:2018op45886	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Iron, MI	1:2018op45888	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 Novartis AG Sandoz International	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Iron, MI	1:2018op45888	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Clinton, MI	1:2018op45889	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
					Sandoz International				
County of Clinton, MI	1:2018op45889	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of St. Clair, MI	1:2018op45896	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	-	12/1/2022 Novartis AG Sandoz International	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of St. Clair, MI	1:2018op45896	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Charlevoix, MI	1:2018op45897	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
					Sandoz International				
County of Charlevoix, MI City of East Lansing, MI	1:2018op45897	Weitz & Luxenberg	No No		12/1/2022 GmbH 12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes Yes	No No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of East Lansing, IVII	1:2018op45902	Weitz & Luxenberg	INO		Sandoz International		INO		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of East Lansing, MI	1:2018op45902	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson							
County of Hudson, NJ	1:2018op45937	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
					Sandoz International				Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to Lori Cohen, Greenberg Traurig, on 6/10/2019 and
Bland County, VA	1:2018op46065	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		GmbH	Yes	In Process		on 2/17/2023.
Grayson County, VA	1:2018op46069	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	In Process		Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to Lori Cohen, Greenberg Traurig, on 6/14/2019 and on 2/17/2023.
drayson county, vA	1.20180p40009	wagstan & Cartinen	les		Sandoz International	ies	III FIOCESS		Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to Lori Cohen, Greenberg Traurig, on 6/14/2019 and
Wythe County, VA	1:2018op46072	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		GmbH	Yes	In Process		on 2/17/2023.
					Sandoz International				Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to Lori Cohen, Greenberg Traurig, on 6/14/2019 and
Tazewell County, VA	1:2018op46167	Wagstaff & Cartmell Skikos Crawford Skikos	Yes		GmbH	Yes	In Process		on 2/17/2023.
		& Joseph							
		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Sandoz International				A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz
Livingston County, MO	1:2018op46168	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	International GmbH on 2/17/23.
County of Ingham, MI	1:2018op46178	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Ingham, MI	1:2018op46178	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Sandoz International 12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Higham, Wil	1.20100p401/6	Skikos Crawford Skikos	140		14 1 2022 OHIDH	103	140		Jerrea sandos, me.
		& Joseph							
		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Sandoz International				A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz
City of Overland Park, KS	1:2018op46287	Bertram & Graf	Yes No	N/A	GmbH 12/19/2022 Sandoz Inc.	Yes Yes	No Yes	N/A	International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Henry County, GA	1:2018op46310	Napoli Shkolnik	טאון		12/13/2022 SandOZ IIIC.	162	162	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23

Board of County								
Commissioners of Pawnee								
County, OK	1:2018op46320	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Board of County								
Commissioners of Delaware								
County, OK	1:2018op46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Board of County								
Commissioners of Osage County, OK	1:2018op46322	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
County, OK	1.20160p46322	Napoli Silkolilik	NO	1/3/2023 Sandoz IIIC.	163	163	2/22/2023	emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Sandoz Inc.; pending
Grady County, GA*	1:2018op46338	Conley Griggs Partin LLF	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed waiver
County of Kent, MI	1:2019op45000	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
				Sandoz International				
County of Kent, MI	1:2019op45000	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
Delta de la Cale de la Cale de		Gainsburgh, Benjamin,						
Police Jury of the Parish of	1:2019op45012	David, Meunier &	No	1/30/2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Pointe Coupee, LA	1:20190p45012	Warshauer, LLC Skikos Crawford Skikos		1/30/2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
		& Joseph						
Unified Government of		Wagstaff & Cartmell		Sandoz International				A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz
Wyandotte County, KS	1:2019op45015	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	International GmbH on 2/17/23.
								emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Sandoz Inc.; pending
Atkinson County, GA	1:2019op45118	Conley Griggs Partin LLF	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		receipt of signed Waiver
		Friedman, Dazzio &						
Blount County, TN	1:2019op45132	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
								PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these
								pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on
								3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted
								Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the
								folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on
								3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format
								of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one
								pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the
								PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
		Friedman, Dazzio &						reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
City of Rainsville, AL, et al.	1:2019op45135	Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Wilkes County, GA	1:2019op45171	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,		1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1				Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Towns County, GA	1:2019op45172	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
McIntosh County, GA	1:2019op45173	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Weintosh County, GA	1.20130p43173	Blasingame, Burch,	140	12/14/2022 Novaitis Ad	163	110		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Cherokee County, GA	1:2019op45174	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		Blasingame, Burch,		, , , ,				Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Glascock County, GA	1:2019op45175	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Pulaski County, GA	1:2019op45176	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Rabun County, GA	1:2019op45177	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Effingham County, GA	1:2019op45178	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Pike County GA	1:2019op45179	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Pike County, GA	1.20130P431/3	Blasingame, Burch,	INU	12/ 14/ 2022 NOVALUS AG	162	INU		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Early County, GA	1:2019op45180	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
	2.20130p+3100	Blasingame, Burch,	1	22, 21, 2022 110 401 113 710	1.00			Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Seminole County, GA	1:2019op45181	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		Blasingame, Burch,						Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign

						<u> </u>			
									Sandoz, Inc. has not alleged a service defect. However, Novartis AG has alleged a service defect.
		Placingama Purch							
	4 2040 45404	Blasingame, Burch,			12/12/2022 5 1 / / / / / / / /				Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Clay County, GA	1:2019op45194	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Sandoz/Novartis	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Stephens County, GA	1:2019op45195	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Long County, GA	1:2019op45196	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Clinch County, GA	1:2019op45197	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
									Sandoz, Inc. has not alleged a service defect. However, Novartis AG has alleged a service defect.
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Clinch County, GA	1:2019op45197	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Sandoz/Novartis	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Screven County, GA	1:2019op45198	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
City of Springfield, GA	1:2019op45199	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Liberty County, GA	1:2019op45200	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
-		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Jefferson County, GA	1:2019op45201	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,	1		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1	-		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Randolph County, GA	1:2019op45202	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
nandolph county, GA	1.20130p+3202	Blasingame, Burch,	140		12/14/2022 Novartis Ad	163	110		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Greene County, GA	4.204045202	_	No		12/14/2022 Newartis AC	Vos	No		
Greene County, GA	1:2019op45203	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	INO		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	NO		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Wayne County, GA	1:2019op45204	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Burke County, GA	1:2019op45207	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/13/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Spalding County, GA	1:2019op45208	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Emanuel County, GA	1:2019op45209	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
•	·	Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Dawson County, GA	1:2019op45210	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
,,		Blasingame, Burch,			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Lumpkin County, GA	1:2019op45211	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Editipkiii County, GA	1.20130p43211	O'Leary, Shelton,	110		12/14/2022 Novartis Ad	163	110		corporation is suspended until further order of the court. (Doc. 232).
		-							Emailed Waiver request to Defense Counsel (cohenl@gtlaw.com) on 10/11/19 b but no reply was
City of Managabia TNI	4-204045220	Corrigan, Peterson, Dalton & Quillin, LLC	N-		11/10/2022 5	V	V	2/17/2023	received from Defendant. Alias Summons served on 2/17/23
City of Memphis, TN	1:2019op45220	Daiton & Quillin, LLC	No		11/18/2022 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/1//2023	received from Defendant. Allas Summons served on 2/17/23
Seminole County Board of	4 2040 45200	No. of Children			4/2/2022 5 - 1 - 1			2/22/2022	1 1 2 /47 /22
County Commissioners, OK	1:2019op45260	Napoli Shkolnik	NO		1/3/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Montgomery County, GA	1:2019op45292	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/11/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Fayette County, GA	1:2019op45293	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No		12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Prestonsburg, KY	1:2019op45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
Davis (Sheriff of Bibb County),		Blasingame, Burch,							Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
GA	1:2019op45360	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	n/a	Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Board of Commissioners of									
	1:2019op45440	Zoll & Kranz LLC	No		3/22/2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
-1/ -	1.4	Simmons Hanly Conroy,			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
Calcasieu Parish Police Jury, LA	1·2019on45445	LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	
calcusted i arisin i office sary, EA	1.20130043443	Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Sandoz me.	163	103	3/20/2013	
Ouachita Parish Police Jury, LA	1,2010on4E446	LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Voc	6/13/2019	
Juacinta Falish Funce July, LA	1.20130p43440	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		+	Sandoz IIIC.	162	Yes	0/13/2013	
Cahina David- Dalias I	1,2010 45 140	, , , ,			Carralla III	V = -	\ _{V=-}	0/20/2040	
Sabine Parish Police Jury, LA	1:2019op45448	LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
City of Lake Charles, LA	1:2019op45449	LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	
Evangeline Parish Police Jury,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
LA	1:2019op45450	LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	
	· <u> </u>	Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Vernon Parish Police Jury, LA	1:2019op45451	LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	
Morehouse Parish Police Jury,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
LA	1:2019op45452	LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	
		1 -	1	1	1-2	1.50	1.55	1.,,	1

	_								
East Carroll Parish Police Jury,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:2019op45453	LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	
West Carroll Parish Police Jury,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,					.,	c / 10 / 10 10	
	1:2019op45454	LLC Brunt Law Contor	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	
City of Inez, KY	1:2019op45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
									Documents are out for service with the Clerk of the Court. Waiver of service was sent on
				11/29/2022 - sent to					9/17/2019 to counsel of record, Lori G. Cohen, but no response was ever received. Service by Clerk.
				PFS counsel on					Summons and Complaint addressed to Sandoz Inc. placed in U.S. Mail. Type of service: Certified
County of Curry, OR	1:2019op45512	D'Amore Law Group, P.C	No	11/21/22	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Mail. Receipt # 9314 7699 0430 0104 6169 68. (F,ML) (Entered: 03/03/2023) - Docket No. 42
County of Curry, OK	1.20190043312	D Amore Law Group, F.C	NO	11/21/22	Sandoz IIIC.	163	III FIOCESS		From review of internal records, waiver of Service sent on November 26, 2019 when filing its short-
									form amended complaint by regular mail to counsel of record. Upon notice of the deficiency,
									waiver of service sent on 03.08.2023 to counsel of record by email and by United States Postal
		Wallace Jordan Ratliff &							Service (certified, tracking no. 70211970000143107917) to Company, signed for by Roger
City of Hoover, AL	1:2019op45746	Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Bousquet on March 14, 2023.
oley of theorem, the	1.20130013740	Didiide 220	1.10	20,20,2022	54.1462.1161		1.00	3/ 14/ 2023	Sound and the second
									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Mandeville City, LA	1:2019op45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
manaeville eleq, E :	1.202300 .3733	Leger & onan	1.65		54.14.52 11.61	1.00	1.00	5/1//2020	
									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Pearl River, LA	1:2019op45754	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						1, ,	, , ,
Bingham County, ID	1:2019op45758	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	11/7/2019	
"	,			, ,				,,,	
									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
City of Slidell, LA	1:2019op45769	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
	· ·								
Washington Parish									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Government, LA	1:2019op45773	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
·	· ·								Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/17/23. Sandoz added on short form. No waiver
									filed on the docket by Sandoz per CTO 1. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No response received
									from Sandoz after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Letter
									received from Sandoz on 3/17/23 declining to sign waiver and claiming Sandoz incorrectly named
Ada County, ID	1:2019op45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	as there is no comma in Sandoz Inc.
, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1:2019op45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
The City of Ogdensburg, NY	1:2019op45852	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
	1:2019op45853	Napoli Shkolnik	No	_	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
	1:2019op45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
The Fiscal Court of Casey									
County, KY	1:2019op45887	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
The Fiscal Court of Lewis									
County, KY	1:2019op45889	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
The Fiscal Court of Gallatin									
County, KY	1:2019op45891	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/17/23. Sandoz added on short form. No waiver
Board of County									filed on the docket by Sandoz per CTO 1. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No response received
Commissioners of the County									from Sandoz after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Letter
of Mesa, CO									received from Sandoz on 3/17/23 declining to sign waiver and claiming Sandoz incorrectly named
	1:2019op45923	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	as there is no comma in Sandoz Inc.
									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/17/23. Sandoz added on short form. No waiver
									filed on the docket by Sandoz per CTO 1. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No response received
									from Sandoz after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Letter
									received from Sandoz on 3/17/23 declining to sign waiver and claiming Sandoz incorrectly named
Lincoln County, WA	1:2019op45962	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	as there is no comma in Sandoz Inc.
									Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/17/23. Sandoz added on short form. No waiver
									filed on the docket by Sandoz per CTO 1. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No response received
									from Sandoz after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Letter
									received from Sandoz on 3/17/23 declining to sign waiver and claiming Sandoz incorrectly named
City of Greeley, CO	1:2019op45977	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	as there is no comma in Sandoz Inc.
		Weisbrod Matteis &							
		Copley PLLC, Cooper							
	1:2019op46071	Levenson	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
City of Buffalo, NY	1:2019op46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No		Sandoz/Novartis	No			
	4 2040 46462	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No		1	
	1:2019op46162		NO		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	1:20190p46162 1:2019op46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No		2 Sandoz/Novartis	No No			

	T	I	T., T		T	1		
Lawrence County, KY	1:2019op46184	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
County of Hawaii, HI Fiscal Court of Monroe County	1:2020op45014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
riscal Court of Monroe County	·	The Finnell Firm	Voc	Condon Inc	Vas	Vos	2/16/2023	
The City of Calais, ME	1:2020op45016 1:2020op45051	The Finnell Firm Napoli Shkolnik	Yes No	Sandoz Inc. 12/14/2022 Sandoz/Novartis	Yes No	Yes	2/16/2023	
The City of Calais, IVIE	1.20200p43031	Blasingame, Burch,	140	12/14/2022 Sandoz/Novartis	140			Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Evans County, GA	1:2020op45080	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
	1.202000 10000	Blasingame, Burch,				110		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign
Appling County, GA	1:2020op45081	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022 Novartis AG	Yes	No		corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
		Skikos Crawford Skikos						
		& Joseph						Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
The City of Sedalia, Pettis		Wagstaff & Cartmell						waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
County, MO	1:2020op45152	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A Sandoz Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Sandoz Inc. on 2/17/23.
Leland Falcon (Sheriff of								
Assumption Parish), LA	1:2020op45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
St. Bernard Parish School				Novartis				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Board, LA	1:2021op45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023 Pharmaceuticals Corp.	. Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School				- / /				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Board, LA	1:2021op45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
								Developed Complete of short form amonded complete to the state of the
Town of Gramorey IA	1:2021an4E021	Logor & Chau	No	2/16/2022 Sandaz Inc	Vos	Voc	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Town of Gramercy, LA	1:2021op45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/1//2023	pervice of process made 3/10/2023. Executed neturn of service filed 3/17/2023.
St. James Parish School Board,				Novartis				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
I Δ	1:2021op45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023 Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Ves	Yes	3/14/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
St. James Parish School Board,	1.20210043034	Legel & Silaw	INO	3/17/2023 Filarmaceuticals Corp.	. 163	163	3/14/2023	Service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Neturn of Service med 3/14/2023.
I A								Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
	1:2021op45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
							5/11/1525	
								Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Lutcher, LA	1:2021op45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board	,			Novartis				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
LA	1:2021op45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023 Pharmaceuticals Corp.	. Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board	<i>'</i>							Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
LA	1:2021op45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023 Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
								Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Hancock County Board of								fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Education, TN, et al.	1:2022op45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Manian Carreto Based of								Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Marion County Board of	1,20220745020	Mohri 9 Chalat DUC	Voc	Condon Inc	Vas	In Draces		fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Education, WV, et al. Clinton County, MO v. Allergar	1:2022op45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Sandoz Inc. Pharmacy Buying	Yes	In Process		served on Feb. 23, 2023.
PLC et al	1:20-op- 45130-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Pike County, MO v. Allergan	1.20-0p- 45130-DAF	Theodora Ornigher FC	163	Pharmacy Buying	163	163	1/2//2023	
PLC et al	1:20-op- 45131-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Ray County, MO v. Allergan	1.20 OF 10101 DAI		1.20	Pharmacy Buying	1.55		1,2,,2023	
PLC et al	1:20-op- 45132-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Lawrence County, MO v.				Pharmacy Buying		1	_, _,	
Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45134-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Henry County, MO v. Allergan		J -		Pharmacy Buying				
PLC et al	1:20-op- 45135-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Dade County, MO v. Allergan				Pharmacy Buying				
PLC et al	1:20-op- 45224-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
McDonald County, MO v.				Pharmacy Buying				
Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45225-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
			T					
Catawba Nation v. Endo Healt				Pharmacy Buying				Plaintiff's counsel sent waiver request to Pharmacy Buying Association on 2/21/2023, but did not
land the second second	1:20-op- 45234-DAP	Fields Han Cunniff PLLC	Yes	Association	Yes	In Process		receive a waiver of service within 30 days. Plaintiff's counsel will serve process via process server.
Solutions, Inc. et al.	1.20-0p- 45254-DAP	110100110110011111111111111111111111111		Association				
White Mountain Apache	1.20-0p- 43234-DAP							
	1:20-op- 45243-DAP	Fields Han Cunniff PLLC		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	In Process		Plaintiff's counsel sent waiver request to Pharmacy Buying Association on 2/21/2023, but did not receive a waiver of service within 30 days. Plaintiff's counsel will serve process via process server.

	_			1		1	1	
Adair Co., MO v. Allergan PLC,				Pharmacy Buying				
	1:20-op- 45297-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Andrew Co., MO v. Allergan				Pharmacy Buying				
	1:20-op- 45298-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
DeKalb County, MO v. Allergan				Pharmacy Buying				
	1:20-op- 45299-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Grundy County, MO v. Allergan				Pharmacy Buying				
PLC, et al	1:20-op- 45300-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
BOCC of Love County, OK	1:20-op-45000	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Atoka County Board of								
	1:20-op-45001	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County	'							
Commissioners of Atoka								
County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45001	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:20-op-45001	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Haskell								
	1:20-op-45002	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Haskell County, OK	1:20-op-45002	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Haskell County Board of	2.20 OF 13002		·		1.50	1.20	5, 10, 2025	
County Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45002	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Haskell County Board of	1.20-0p-43002	ruiller 3iii	res	Sandoz inc.	163	163	3/10/2023	
County Commissioners,								
	1:20 on 45002	Fulmer Sill	Vos	Hikma	Vos	Voc	3/20/2023	
	1:20-op-45002	Fulffler Sill	Yes	Пікіпа	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Latimer		5 1 0:11			.,		0 /4 6 /0 0 0 0	
County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45003	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Latimer County, OK	1:20-op-45003	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Latimer County Board of								
County Commissioners,								
	1:20-op-45003	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
City of Seminole, OK	1:20-op-45004	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Seminole, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45004	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	No			
		Levin Papantonio						
Village of Pleasant Prairie, WI	1:20-op-45010	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech		Yes	5/8/2020	
				Amneal				
County of Hawaii	1:20-op-45014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
County of Hawaii, Hawaii	1:20-op-45014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hikma	No			
County of Hawaii, Hawaii	1:20-op-45014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	No			
Fiscal Court of Monroe County,								
	1:20-op-45016	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Borough of Exeter v.	·			<u> </u>				
AmerisourceBergen Drug		Levin Papantonio						
	1:20-op-45019	Rafferty	Yes	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/2/2020	
F,	12 Tp 13020	,					1-1	
BOCC of Cimarron County, OK	1:20-op-45021	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Anadarko, OK	1:20-op-45022	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Anadarko, OK	1:20-op-45022	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Alladarko, OK	1.20-0p-43022	Tallifer Sill	100	Sandoz inc.	1.03	103	3/ 10/ 2023	
City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin	1:20-op-45044	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hikma	No			
City of iviliwaukee, wisconsin	1.20-υμ-45044	INAPOII SIIKOIIIK	100	HIKHId	INU			
City of Milwayless Misses	1:20-op-45044	Napoli Chkolaile	Vos	Amnoal	No			
		Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Amneal	No			
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	1:20-op-45044	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Mylan	No			

	1	1	1	1	1	1	T	T	
Amherst County, VA Calais, Maine	1:20-op-45046 1:20-op-45051	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	12/14/2022	Indivior	Yes No	In Process		Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. In the meantime, and out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel has recently requested waivers of service for this case. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
City of Calais, Maine	·	<u> </u>	No	12/14/2022	+ ·	No			
	1:20-op-45051	Napoli Shkolnik							
City of Calais, ME	1:20-op-45051	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022		No			
The City of Calais, Maine	1:20-op-45051	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022		No			Nation of Valuatory Dismissal Without Desirely filed February 24, 2022
Carol County, Michigan	1:20-op-45052-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes			Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
County of Angelina, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:20-op-45053	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
County of Angelina, Texas v.		Simon Greenstone			Amneal				
Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:20-op-45053	Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
		Simon Greenstone							
County of Angelina, Texas v	1:20-op-45053	Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Amneal	No			
County of Alameda, California; City of Costa Mesa, California; City of Anaheim, California; City of Santa Ana, California; City of San Clemente, California; City of Encinitas, California; City of La Habra, California; City of La Mesa, California; City of Oxnard,									
California; City of Placentia,				5/5/2020 and					
California	1:20-op-45055	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes	reserved on 2/12/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
County of Alameda, California; City of Costa Mesa, California; City of Anaheim, California; City of Santa Ana, California; City of San Clemente, California; City of Encinitas, California; City of La Habra, California; City of La Mesa, California; City of Oxnard, California; City of Placentia,				5/5/2020 and					
California	1:20-op-45055	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes	reserved on 2/12/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	

	T		T		1	T		
BOCC of Oklahoma County, OK	1:20 on 45056	Fulmer Sill	Vos	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County	1:20-0p-45056	Fuirfier Siii	Yes	GCP Pharma	res	res	3/10/2023	
Commissioners of Oklahoma	4 20 45057	5 1 671	v	l e			2/20/2022	
County, OK	1:20-op-45057	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Oklahoma				l				
	1:20-op-45057	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Logan								
	1:20-op-45058	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Logan								
	1:20-op-45058	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of Logan County, OK	1:20-op-45058	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Logan County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45058	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
The Fiscal Court of Adair		Levin Papantonio						
County (KY)	1:20-op-45059	Rafferty	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
The Fiscal Court of Adair								
County, on Behalf of Adair		Levin Papantonio		Amneal				
County, Kentucky	1:20-op-45059	Rafferty	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	03/08/2023	
Board of County								
Commissioners of Texas								
County, OK	1:20-op-45061	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Texas County, OK	1:20-op-45061	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
-	·	Bahe Cook Cantley &						
		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn						
City of Henderson et al., KY	1:20-op-45062	Law	No	1/10/2023 KVK-Tech	No			
•	·	Bahe Cook Cantley &						
		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn						
City of Henderson, Kentucky	1:20-op-45062	Law	No	1/10/2023 Hikma	Yes	Yes	9/23/2019	
•		Bahe Cook Cantley &						
		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn						
City of Henderson, Kentucky	1:20-op-45062	Law	No	1/10/2023 Mylan	No			
, , ,		Bahe Cook Cantley &	-	-,,	1			
City of Henderson, Kentucky,		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn						
et al.	1:20-op-45062	Law	No	1/10/2023 Amneal	No			
	2.20 OP 43002	Bahe Cook Cantley &		1/10/2023 Annica	1.10			
Hardin County Fiscal Court et		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn						
	1:20-op-45063	Law	Yes	KVK-Tech	No			
ui., ixi	1.20-υμ-43003	Bahe Cook Cantley &	1 03	NVN-TECH	INO			
Hardin County Fiscal Court,		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn						
	1:20-op-45063			Hikma	Voc	Voc	9/23/2019	
Kentucky, et al.	1.20-0p-45063	Law Bahe Cook Cantley &	Yes	нікта	Yes	Yes	3/23/2013	
Handin Carrett Florid Co. 1								
Hardin County Fiscal Court,		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn			1			
Kentucky, et al.	1:20-op-45063	Law	Yes	Amneal	No			
		Bahe Cook Cantley &						
Hardin County Fiscal Court,		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn						
Kentucky	1:20-op-45063	Law	Yes	Mylan	No			

	1			T	_		T		
Botetourt County, VA	1:20-op-45064	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. In the meantime, and out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel has recently requested waivers of service for this case. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
Botetourt County, VA Board of County	1:20-op-45064	LLP	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		subdivision additional time for service.
Commissioners of LeFlore									
County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45067	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of LeFlore County, OK	1:20-op-45067	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
LeFlore County Board of	·							, ,	
Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45067	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Morris & Dickson	No			
Bertucci, as the Coroner of St. Bernard Parish, and St. Bernard Parish Coroner's Office	1:20-OP-45077	Porteous, Hainkel & Johnson,	Yes		TopRx	Yes	In Process		This Defendant was named in Plaintiff's Short Form Amended Complaint in which electronic notice was provided to all newly named Defendants therein. Prior to Defendant's recent submission that included Plaintiff on a list of those with service issues, Plaintiff was unaware there was an alleged service defect Plaintiff had also received multiple phone calls from counsel for Defendant requesting to discuss voluntary dismissal for substantive reasons, causing Plaintiff to believe Defendant had either been served or accepted service. Due to this, perfection of service is being requested/is in process.
Bertucci, Dr. Bryan for St. Bernard Parish Coroner's Office, Louisiana	1:20-op-45077	Porteous, Hainkel & Johnson,	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		This Defendant was named in Plaintiff's Short Form Amended Complaint in which electronic notice was provided to all newly named Defendants therein. Prior to Defendant's recent submission that included Plaintiff on a list of those with service issues, Plaintiff was unaware there was an alleged service defect Due to this, perfection of service is being requested/is in process.
Bryan Bertucci, Coroner; St. Bernard Parish Coroner, Louisiana	1:20-op-45077	Porteous, Hainkel & Johnson,	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		This Defendant was named in Plaintiff's Short Form Amended Complaint in which electronic notice was provided to all newly named Defendants therein. Prior to Defendant's recent submission that included Plaintiff on a list of those with service issues, Plaintiff was unaware there was an alleged service defect Due to this, perfection of service is being requested/is in process.
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 3/23/20.
Evans County (GA)	1:20-op-45080	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/23/2020	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Evans County, Georgia	1:20-op-45080	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Evans County, Georgia	1.20-0p-43000	Blasingame, Burch,	INU	12/14/2022	IIIAIIIa	INU			
Evans County, Georgia	1:20-op-45080	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Evans County, Georgia	1:20-op-45080	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,							Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 03/20/20.
Appling County (GA)	1:20-op-45081	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/20/2020	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 02/01/23.
Appling County, Georgia	1:20-op-45081	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	 Hikma	No			
Appling County, Georgia	1.20-0h-43001	Janara & Asiliey, P.C.	1110	12/13/2022	Tinkina	1110			

_	1	T			T			
		Blasingame, Burch,			L.			
Appling County, Georgia	1:20-op-45081	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No 12/13/	2022 Mylan	No			
la li control	4 20 45004	Blasingame, Burch,	12/12/	2022				
Appling County, Georgia	1:20-op-45081	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No 12/13/	2022 Amneal	No			
Polk County, Missouri	1:20-op-45082	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	 Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Polk County, Missouri	1:20-op-45082	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
				Novartis				
	1:20-op-45082	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.		Yes	1/27/2023	
Polk County, Missouri	1:20-op-45082-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Sugar Notch Borough, Pennsylvania v. AmerisourceBergen Drug		Levin Papantonio						
Corporation, et al.	1:20-op-45090	Rafferty	Yes	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	03/06/2023	
Acadia-St. Landry Hospital Service District	1:20-op-45097	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	No	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Hospital Service District No. 1 of the Parish of Avoyelles, State of Louisiana	1:20-op-45098	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	No	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a PFS. "
lowa Tribe of Kansas and		Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Bertram & Graf The Popham Law Firm Bryan, Lykins &		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American				Plaintiff is a Tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not
Nebraska, Kansas	1:20-op-45099	Hejtmanek		Associated Pharmacies	s Yes		N/A	apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
County of Madison, Mississippi	1:20-op-45106	Napoli Shkolnik	No 1/2/	2023 Hikma	No			
County of Madison, Mississippi	1:20-op-45106	Napoli Shkolnik	No 1/2/	2023 Mylan	No			
Patty Carol Leysen	1:20-op-45107	Pinto Coates Kyre & Bowers, PLLC		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacie	s Yes			THIS IS AN INDIVIDUAL CLAIMANT, NOT A SUBDIVISION OR A GOVERNMENT ENTITY
Panidos Parish Polico Juny	1.20 on 45111	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Vos	Louisiana Wholesale	Voc	Vos	C /E /2020	
Rapides Parish Police Jury City of Kirkland, Washington	1:20-op-45111	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	6/5/2020	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Kirkland, Washington	1:20-op-45121	Neller NOIII Dack L.L.P.	Yes	ПIКIIId	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Mylan added on short form. Waiver
	1:20-op-45121	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	request sent 2/15/2023. No waiver received after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/13/2023.
Phillip Terrell, Rapides Parish		Levin Papantonio						
	1:20-op-45123	Rafferty	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes		10/16/2020	
Phillip Terrell, Rapides Parish	4 20 17127	Levin Papantonio		Louisiana Wholesale		ļ,,	c /o /oooc	
	1:20-op-45123	Rafferty	Yes	Drug	Yes	Yes	6/8/2020	
City of Stewart, FL	1:20-op-45124-DAP	The Law Office of Travis	vites	Michael Babich	Yes	In Process		
Board of County Commissioners of Jackson								
	1:20-op-45126	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Vac	3/16/2023	
Board of County	1.20-0h-43120	i dillici Sili	163	IIIuiviUi	163	Yes	3/10/2023	
Commissioners of Jackson								
	1:20-op-45126	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Scarrey, Oktonoma	op -	. umer om		riikiilu	1.03	163	3, 20, 2023	
BOCC of Jackson County, OK	1:20-op-45126	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Jackson County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45126	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Lincoln County Board of	·			-				
County Commissioners,								
	1:20-op-45128	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/10/2023	1

			<u></u>					
BOCC of Noble County, OK	1:20-op-45129	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Noble County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45129	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Clinton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45130	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
				Novartis				
Clinton County, MO	1:20-op-45130	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
								· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
							1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Clinton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45130	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Clinton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45130-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
								· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
							1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Pike County, Missouri	1:20-op-45131	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Pike County, Missouri	1:20-op-45131	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
				Novartis				
Pike County, MO	1:20-op-45131	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Pike County, Missouri	1:20-op-45131-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No	, ,	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
.,,								, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
								· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
							1/27/2023	Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/20/2023
Ray County, Missouri	1:20-op-45132	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Ray County, Missouri	1:20-op-45132	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	Notice of Voluntary Distrissar Without Frequence as to Mylan N.V. Only filed restrainy 24, 2025
Ray County, Iviissouri	1.20-0p-43132	Theodora Offingher FC	163	Hikilia	163	163	1/27/2023	
				Novartis				
Ray County, MO	1,20 on 45122	Theodora Oringher BC	Voc	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Vos	Voc	1/27/2023	
Ray County, IVIO	1:20-op-45132	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	res	Yes	1/2//2023	
								Comics Perfected on Mulan Institutional Inc. on 01/27/2022
							4 /27 /2022	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
		TI	V				1/27/2023	Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Vernon County, Missouri	1:20-op-45133	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Vernon County, Missouri	1:20-op-45133	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
				Novartis				
Vernon County, MO	1:20-op-45133	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.		Yes	1/27/2023	
Vernon County, Missouri	1:20-op-45133-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Lawrence County, Missouri	1:20-op-45134	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
				Novartis				
Lawrence County, MO	1:20-op-45134	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
								· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
							1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Lawrence County, Missouri	1:20-op-45134	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Lawrence County, Missouri	1:20-op-45134-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
								· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
							1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Henry County, Missouri	1:20-op-45135	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Henry County, Missouri	1:20-op-45135	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
				Novartis				
Henry County, MO	1:20-op-45135	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Henry County, Missouri	1:20-op-45135-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No	1	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
, ,,	,	<u> </u>						
BOCC of Woodward County, Ok	1:20-op-45141	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2							-11	
Woodward County Board of								
County Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45141	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
country commissioners, OK	op 10111	. diritor Jili	1.03	Sundoz IIIC.	103	103	3/ 10/ 2023	
Woodward County Board of								
County Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45141	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
-	1.20-0h-43141	i uiiiici 3III	153	illuivior	162	162	3/10/2023	
Woodward County Board of								
County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45141	Fulmor Cill	Vas	1101	l _{vas}	Vas	2/20/2022	
	LL 7U-00-45141	Fulmer Sill	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	

Woodward County Board of	1				1	1			
Woodward County Board of County Commissioners,									
1 -	1:20-op-45141	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Oklanoma	1.20-0β-43141	Tullier Sill	163		Iviyiaii	163	163	3/10/2023	
City of Fullerton, California;				6/30/2020 and					Fullerton fact sheet submitted on 6/30/20; Westminster fact sheet submitted on 6/30/20 and
City of Westminster, California	1:20-op-45143	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes	reserved 2/12/23	Mylan	No			again on 2/12/23.
erty or Westimister, edinorina	1.20 OP 43143	ROOMS Rapidir EE	163	16561764 2/12/25	Wiyiuii	110			ugun on 2, 12, 25.
City of Fullerton, California;				6/30/2020 and					Fullerton fact sheet submitted on 6/30/20; Westminster fact sheet submitted on 6/30/20 and
City of Westminster, California	1:20-op-45143	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes	reserved 2/12/23	Mylan	No			again on 2/12/23.
Board of County	1.20 op .51 .6	resins napian 22	1.00	1	,				-0
Commissioners of Beckham									
	1:20-op-45146	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County			1.00					5/ = 5/ = 5 = 5	
Commissioners of Beckham									
County, OK v. Cephalon, Inc. et					Pharmacy Buying				
al	1:20-op-45146	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Association	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
								, ,	
Board of County									
Commissioners of Beckham									
County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45146	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
	<u> </u>								
Board of County									
Commissioners of Beckham									
County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45146	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County	<u> </u>								
Commissioners of Coal County,									
Oklahoma	1:20-op-45149	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Coal County, OK	1:20-op-45149	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Coal County Board of County	·								
Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45149	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	·								
The Board of County		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
Commissioners for Allen		& Joseph							
County, KS & Jerry Hathaway,		Wagstaff & Cartmell							Allen County, KS was initially included on KVK-Tech's 1/30/23 deficiency list. However, Allen County
Allen County Attorney	1:20-op-45151	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	KVK-Tech	No			was removed from KVK-Tech's amended deficiency list filed on 2/6/23.
The Board of County									
Commissioners for Allen		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
County, Kansas and Jerry		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
Hathaway, Allen County		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
Attorney	1:20-op-45151	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
		Skikos Crawford Skikos							
		& Joseph							Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The
The City of Sedalia, Pettis		Wagstaff & Cartmell			Amneal				waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to
County, Missouri	1:20-op-45152	Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
									The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and
									fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In
					American Sales				addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
Cayuga Nation	1:20-op-45153				Company, LLC	Yes			Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
									The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and
									fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In
									addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
Cayuga Nation v. Cephalon, Inc.	., 1:20-op-45153				Value Drug	Yes			Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Board of County									
Commissioners of Muskogee									
	1:20-op-45155	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Board of Supervisors for									
Louisiana State University and									This client is not a political subdivision and therefore not subject to submission of a PFS. This
Agricultural and Mechanical					Louisiana Wholesale				plaintiff should not be included on this spreadsheet and is not subject to compliance/issues raised
College	1:20-op-45157	Irpino Avin Hawkins	No		Drug	No			in the Order at Dkt. 4801.
	17.70 as 45167	Fulmer Sill	Yes	1	I IV /I v / a ra	LVOC	IVoc		1
	1:20-op-45162 1:20-op-45162	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan Indivior	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	3/16/2023 3/16/2023	

Case: 1:17-md-02804-DAP Doc #: 4977-1 Filed: 03/29/23 197 of 225. PageID #: 611588

	1	1		1		1		
City of Morganfield, Kentucky	1:20-op-45167	Frazer PLC	No 2/6/2023	Henry Schein	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service Requested; no response.
City of Morganfield, Kentucky	1:20-op-45167	Frazer PLC	No 2/6/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service Requested; no response.
etty et mergameta, nemaaty	1.20 op 10107	110201120	2,0,232					Trainer or certified responder
City of Morganfield, Kentucky	1:20-op-45167	Frazer PLC	No 2/6/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service Requested; no response.
Stone County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45168	Frazer PLC	2,0,202	Henry Schein	Yes	111100033		Voluntarily Dismissed as Duplicative Action
				Amneal				
Stone County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45168	Frazer PLC		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes			Voluntarily Dismissed as Duplicative Action
				Amneal				
Stone County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45168	Frazer PLC		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			Voluntarily Dismissed as Duplicative Action
							1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Barton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45171	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Barton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45171	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Barton County, MO	1:20-op-45171	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Barton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45171-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No	7,2,7,2,0,2,0	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
								Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. In the meantime, and out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel has recently requested waivers of service for this case. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1
Mecklenburg County, VA	1:20-op-45174	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes	Indivior	Yes	In Process		because of judicial efficiency concerns, prejudice to plaintiffs, and no prejudice to defendants). Accordingly, the balance of factors weighs in favor of granting the listed subdivisions additional time for service.
ivicekielibuig county, vA	1.20-0p-431/4	LLF	163	Indiviol	163	III FIUCESS	1	unic for service.

Mecklenburg County, Virginia	1:20-op-45174	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Mecklenburg County, Virginia	1:20-op-45174	LLP	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes	In Process	upon receipt from Defendant.
						On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of		with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1

Maakkashura Cauntu Virgisia	1:20 an 45174	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Vec		Amneal	Vec	In Diseases		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 legendant of the perfect of the perfect of the perfect of the perfect of the perfect of the perfect of the perfect of the perfect of the perfect of the perfect of the perfect of the perfect of the pe
Mecklenburg County, Virginia	1:20-op-45174	LLP	Yes		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		upon receipt from Defendant.
BOCC of Comanche County, OK	1·20-on-45180	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County	Op 10100					. 50		0, 20, 2020	
Commissioners of Custer									
**	1:20-op-45182	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:20-op-45182	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Roger Mills									
	1:20-op-45183	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
esunty, skiumema	1.20 op 43103	Tunner Sin	163		iviyian	163	163	3/10/2023	
BOCC of Roger Mills County, OK	1:20-op-45183	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Bedford County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:20-op-45184	Morgan & Morgan Complex Litigation Grou) No	3/14/2022	Value Drug	Yes	No	TBD	A copy of the Complaint was mailed via certified mail and delivered on 3/9/20 per the USPS return in my possession. The only basis for Value Drug's continued assertion that service hasn't been perfected is because the complaint was not served via the Blair County Sheriff's department. However, Value Drug did recieve the Complaint on 3/9/202 and I have proof of delivery.
		Morgan & Morgan		2/11/2000					
Bedford County, Pennsylvania Board of County	1:20-op-45184	Complex Litigation Group	ONIO	3/14/2022	Arnnear	No	Yes		
Commissioners of Tillman									
	1:20-op-45185	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC Tillman County, OK	1:20-op-45185	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:20-op-45190	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023		No			
Hinds County, MS	1:20-op-45190	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023		No			
Assumption Parish Palina III	1:20-op-45205	Logar & Chau	No	2/23/2023	Louisiana Wholesale	No			n/a
Assumption Parish Police Jury	1.20-υμ-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Didg	No			n/a
Assumption Parish Police Jury	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Assumption Parish Police Jury	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Assumption Parish, Louisiana	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Assumption Parish, Louisiana Assumption Parish Police Jury,	1.20-υμ-45205	Legel & SlidW	INO	2/23/2023	iviylali	163	162	5/10/2023	Service of process finduce 3/13/2023. Executed neturn of service filed 3/10/2023.
LA	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Assumption Parish Police Jury, LA	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Indivior	No			

	T	1			T	Т		T	
Assumption Parish Police Jury,									
Louisiana	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023		No			
Leland Falcon, Assumption					Louisiana Wholesale				
Parish Sheriff	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Drug	No			n/a
Leland Falcon, Sheriff of									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Assumption Parish, Louisiana	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
l									
Leland Falcon, Sheriff of									
Assumption Parish, Louisiana									
in his capacity as Officer Ex									
Officio of the Assumption					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Parish Sheriff's Office	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Leland Falcon, Sheriff of									
Assumption Parish, Louisiana									
in his capacity as Officer Ex									
Officio of the Assumption					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No		Pharmaceuticals, Inc.		Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Leland Falcon, Louisiana	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Hikma	No			
Leland Falcon, Sheriff of									
Assumption Parish, in his									
capacity as officer ex officio of									
the Assumption Parish Sheriff's									
Office, LA	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Indivior	No			
West Ascension Parish					Louisiana Wholesale				
Hospital Service District	1:20-op-45207	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023		No			n/a
City of Opelika, Alabama	1:20-op-45208	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Opelika, Alabama; City									
of Spanish Fort, Alabama; City									
of Centreville, Alabama; City of									
Slocomb, Alabama; Town of									
West Blocton, Alabama	1:20-op-45208	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Mylan	No			
					Louisiana Wholesale				
Lafourche Parish Government	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Drug	No			n/a
					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Lafourche Parish Government	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Lafourche Parish Government	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish Government,	·								
· ·	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Lafourche Parish Government,				<u> </u>					
· ·	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Indivior	No			
Lafourche Parish Government,				<u> </u>					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Hikma	No			
	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023		No			
	1:20-op-45213	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023		No			
	1:20-op-45213	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023		No			
	1:20-op-45214	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023		No			
	1:20-op-45214	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023		No			
Bolivar County, MS	1:20-op-45214	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023		No			
			-	1, 5, 2025					
City of Marion, Illinois, a home									
unit v. Teva Pharmaceutical		Levin Papantonio			Amneal				
	1:20-op-45215	Rafferty	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
addired, Etui, et di.	ob +2213	numercy			Amneal		100	5, 25, 2021	
The City of Orlando, Florida	1:20-op-45223	Morgan & Morgan	No	2/17/2022	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Vec	No		Plaintiff decided not to perfect service for defendant Amneal.
The City of Orlando, Florida	1.20-0p-43223	IVIOI gall & IVIOI gall	INO	2/11/2023	i narmaceuticals LLC	163	INO		i idinani decided not to periest service for defendant Anniedi.
					Amneal				
The City of Orlando, Florida	1:20-op-45223	Morgan & Morgan	No	2/17/2022	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Ves	No		Plaintiff decided not to perfect service for defendant Amneal.
THE CITY OF OFFAITUO, FIORIDA	1.20-0p-43223	INIOI Ball & INIOI Ball	140	2/11/2023	i namaceuticais, iiic.	163	INO		riament decided not to perfect service for defendant Annieds.

	1					T			
									· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
								1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Dade County, Missouri	1:20-op-45224	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		/lylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Dade County, Missouri	1:20-op-45224	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		likma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	Treatise of Total Law y Distribute Treatise as to my air Treatise and 2 ty 2020
								, , , , ,	
				l N	lovartis				
Dade County, MO	1:20-op-45224	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	P	harmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Dade County, Missouri	1:20-op-45224-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Nichael Babich	Yes	No	, ,	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
	·								
									· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
								1/27/2023	Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
McDonald County, Missouri	1:20-op-45225	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	l N	⁄lylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
McDonald County, Missouri	1:20-op-45225	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		likma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
-	·								
				l N	lovartis				
McDonald County, MO	1:20-op-45225	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	P	harmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
McDonald County, Missouri	1:20-op-45225-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	N	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
-	·								
									· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
								1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Shawnee County, Kansas	1:20-op-45226	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		/lylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Shawnee County, Kansas,	1:20-op-45226-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	N	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
City of Daphne, Alabama	1:20-op-45227	Mantiply & Assoc.	No	10/28/2022 H	lenry Schein	No			
City of Daphne, Alabama	1:20-op-45227	Mantiply & Assoc.	No	10/28/2022 A	mneal	No			
	·								
									· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
								1/27/2023	Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/31/2023
Town of Cottage City, Maryland	1:20-op-45235	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	l N	/lylan	Yes	Yes	1/31/2023	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	·	j			•				
Town of Cottage City, Forest									
Heights, North									
Brentwood, Upper Marlboro	1:20-op-45235	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	G	iant Food Stores, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/20/2023	
Town of Cottage City,								, , , , ,	
	1:20-op-45235	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Н	likma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Town of Cottage City, MD, et				l N	lovartis				
	1:20-op-45235	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	P	harmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
	·	Ĭ.			·				
Town of Cottage City, Town of									
Forest Heights, Town of North									
Brentwood, and Town of									
	1:20-op-45235	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Ir	ndivior	No			
	·	<u> </u>							
Town of Cottage City, The									
Town of Forest Heights, Town									
of North Brentwood, and The									
-	1:20-op-45235-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	_N	Michael Babich	Yes			Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Scott County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45238	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/5/2023 H		No			
Scott County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45238	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/5/2023 N		No			
Scott County, MS	1:20-op-45238	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/5/2023 lr		No			
City of Clearlake, California, et		Levin Papantonio			mneal				
•	1:20-op-45251	Rafferty	Yes		harmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
City of El Reno, OK	1:20-op-45252	Fulmer Sill	Yes		ndivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of El Reno, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45252	Fulmer Sill	Yes		/lylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Dublin, California; City			1	1/4/21 and reserved	* ·		1.55	5, 25, 2525	
	1:20-op-45255	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes		⁄lylan	Yes	Yes	03/272023	
City of Dublin, California; City			1	1/4/21 and reserved	, · · ·		1.00	55, 2, 2025	
	1:20-op-45255	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes		⁄lylan	Yes	Yes	03/272023	
•	1:20-op-45256	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County						, 55	103	5/ 10/ 2025	
Commissioners of Choctaw									
	1:20-op-45257	Fulmer Sill	Yes		andoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
country, or	1.20 Op-43237	i annici Jili	103	3	anaoz 116.	103	163	3/ 10/ 2023	
BOCC of Hughes County, OK	1:20-op-45258	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		iCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
bocc of fragiles coullty, OK	1.20-0h-43530	ιναροπ οπκοππκ	163	I	r i i i i i i i i i	163	162	3/ 10/ 2023	1

Section Possible prints Programme	
Town of ProgNessepin, New 202-09-02200 Agend Stokolisk No	
Town of Possible Region No. 2000-9-2320 Name No. 2/2/2023 Immune colorable, Inc. No. No. 2/2/2023 Immune colorable, Inc. No. No. No. 2/2/2023 Immune colorable, Inc. No.	
Town of Progrikeropes, New 126-up-45200 Report Shelinik No	
Troom of Positionality New York 120-op-4220 Napoli Shikoniki No 272/2023 Mylan No 1 100-op-120 Napoli Shikoniki No 122/2023 Sandon/Novarita No 1 100-op-120 Napoli Shikoniki No 122/2023 Sandon/Novarita No 1 100-op-120 Napoli Shikoniki No 122/2023 Sandon/Novarita No 1 100-op-120 Napoli Shikoniki No 122/2023 Sandon/Novarita No 1 100-op-120 Napoli Napoli Napoli Shikoniki No 122/2023 Sandon/Novarita No 1 100-op-120 Napoli N	-
Variety Vari	
Town of Fund Marked 120-09-12320 Napoli Shotolik No 10/28/2022 Nime No	
City of Leedung, Alabama, City of Leedung,	
of Inacksorumike, Alabamas, City of Failmonder, Brainmon City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Sahmine, City of Failmondale, Alabama, et al. 120 op 45265 Mantiply & Assoc. No 10/28/2022 Anneal No No Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without City of Failmondale, Alabama, City of Carlor, Balbama, City of Galleria, Balbama, City of Carlor, Balbama, C	
of Jacksonskille, Alabama, City of Fallenskile, Alabama, City of Sahmile, Kalabama, City of Sahmile, Alabama, City of Sahmile, Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Galmeri, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Sahmile, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, City of Sahmile, City of Fullondiele, Alabama, City of Sahmile, C	
Springer Alabama; City of Ragland, Alabama; City of Ragland, Alabama; City of Ragland, Alabama; City of Fultondiale, Alabama; City of Fultondiale, Alabama; City of Fultondiale, Alabama; City of Fultondiale, Alabama; City of Fultondiale, Alabama; City of Fultondiale, Alabama; City of Fultondiale, Alabama; City of Fultondiale, Alabama; City of Fultondiale, Alabama; City of Graymile, Alabama; Cit	
Frod County Kansas 1,20-op-45263-DAP Theodora Oringher PC Yes Michael Babich No No No No No Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without City of Fultondale, Alabama, et al. 1,20-op-45265 Mantiply & Assoc. No 10/28/7022 Manneal No No No No No No No No No No No No No	
Karnsas 1.20-op-45265 AP Theodora Oringher PC Ves Michael Bablich No No No Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without City of Fultondale, Alabama; city of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Fultondale, Alabama; Town of Cedar Bulf, Alabama; Town of Camp-Hill, Alabama; City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Graywille, Alabama; City of Attalla, Alabama; City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Carter, Alabama; City of Attalla, Alabama; City of Attalla, Alabama; City of Turbondale, Alabama; City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Graywille, Alabama; City of Graywille, Alabama; City of Cedera Bulf, Alaba	
al. 120-op-45265 Mantiply & Assoc. No 10/28/2022 Ameal No City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Graywille, Alabama; City of Graywille, Alabama; City of Graywille, Alabama; City of Graywille, Alabama; City of Carden, Alabama; City of Attalla, Alabama; City of Attalla, Alabama; City of Attalla, Alabama; City of Carden, Ala	t Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Centre, Alabama; City of Cedera Buff, Alabama; Town of Cedera Buff, Alabama; Town of Cadra Buff, Alabama; Town of Cadra Buff, Alabama; Town of Cadra Buff, Alabama; Town of Cadra Buff, Alabama; Town of Cadra Buff, Alabama; Town of Cadra Buff, Alabama; Town of Cadra Buff, Alabama; City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Carter, Alabama; Town of Cadra Buff, Alabama; City of Cadra, City of Cadra	
City of Fourty, Alabama; City of Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Gardeville, Alabama; City of Cader Buff, Alabama; City of Cader B	
Amneal Natchitoches Parish Council 1:20-op-45270 Laborde Earles Law Firm Yes Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes Yes 2/1/2021 Affidavit of Service with Certified Mail Natchitoches Parish Council (LA) 1:20-op-45270 Laborde Earles Law Firm Yes JM Smith Yes No	
Natchitoches Parish Council 1:20-op-45270 Laborde Earles Law Firm Yes Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Yes Yes 2/1/2021 Affidavit of Service with Certified Mail Natchitoches Parish Council (LA) 1:20-op-45270 Laborde Earles Law Firm Yes JM Smith Yes No	
Natchitoches Parish Council (LA) 1:20-op-45270 Laborde Earles Law Firm Yes JM Smith Yes No	Receipt and Tracking filed 3/24/23
(LA) 1:20-op-45270 Laborde Earles Law Firm Yes JM Smith Yes No	TOO TO THE THE THE THE THE THE THE THE THE THE
Mantanana Dandan	
Montgomery Ponder, Northwest Al. 20 at 45373	
Northport, AL 1:20-op-45272 LLC Yes Winn-Dixie No Levin Papantonio Amneal	
City of Auburn, Alabama 1:20-op-45282 Rafferty Yes Pharmaceuticals LLC Yes Yes 3/23/2021	
Associated Pharmacies Levin Papantonio Inc/American	
City of Auburn. AL 1:20-op-45282 Rafferty Yes Associated Pharmacies Yes Yes 03/23/2021	
Lower Makefied Township v. Marc J. Bern & Partners,	
Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. 1:20-op-45284 LLP No 3/21/2023 Value Drug Yes No Attempting to locate certified mail rec	ceipt for proof of service

	T		Ţ		T		1	
		Marc J. Bern & Partners		- / /				
Lower Makefield Township	1:20-op-45284	LLP	No	3/21/2023	Amneal	No		
		Marc J. Bern & Partners	·					
	1:20-op-45284	LLP	No	3/21/2023		Yes	No	Attempting to locate certified mail receipt for proof of service
City of Foley, Alabama	1:20-op-45287	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	•	No		
City of Foley, Alabama	1:20-op-45287	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	No		
Dinwiddie County, Virginia	1:20-op-45291	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Yes	10/20/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D
Dinwiddie County, Virginia	1:20-op-45291	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel alos sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 P 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from D

	I					1	
							On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that
							Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those
							cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be
							effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that
							if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the
							tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint,
							subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties'
							agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was
							effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served
							according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that
							Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect
							service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver
							of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver
							of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up
							with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this
							court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid
							unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, [should
							have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management
		5 6 1 1 61					Order No. 1 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to
Dinwiddie County, Virginia	1,20 on 45201	Sanford Heisler Sharp,	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Vec	In Dragons		return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly
Diriwiddie County, Virginia	1:20-op-45291	LLP Yes	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		upon receipt from Defendant.
							Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. In the
							meantime, and out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel has recently requested waivers
							of service for this case. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has
							an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent
							good cause, [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.
							4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ₱ 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision counsel has also filed a
							praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the court returns a signed
							summons. The subdivision's ongoing efforts to perfect service, combined with Defendant's actual
							notice of this lawsuit, constitute good cause under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for the
							subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court does not find good cause here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for service because there is no
							prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice would prejudice the subdivision. Courts
							have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar circumstances where "a defendant
							is already before the court in a consolidated action and 'presumably the only result of a dismissal
							would be that the [] Plaintiffs would refile their complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial
							resources.'" In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine Hydrochloride & Naloxone) Antitrust Litig., 64 F. Supp.
							3d 665, 715 (E.D. Pa. 2014) (collecting cases and ordering Rule 4(m) extension in MDL despite "no
							attempt to establish good cause for failure to serve"). This lack of prejudice to Defendants
							contrasts sharply with the great potential for prejudice to the listed subdivision. While subdivision
							counsel does not concede that any statute of limitations has run for any claims, there is little doubt
							that Defendants will assert that some of subdivisions' claims are time-barred in the listed case. This
							fact is "a factor favoring the plaintiff in a Rule 4(m) analysis." AIG Managed Mkt. Neutral Fund v.
							Askin Cap. Mgmt., L.P., 197 F.R.D. 104, 109 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (granting Rule 4(m) time extension in consolidated actions because of judicial efficiency concerns, prejudice to plaintiffs, and no
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,					prejudice to defendants). Accordingly, the balance of factors weighs in favor of granting the listed
Dinwiddie County, VA	1:20-op-45291	LLP Yes	Indivior	Yes	In Process		subdivision additional time for service.
						. /07/007	Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
Palls County Missouri	1:20 on 45202	Thoodora Oringhar DC	Mylan	Voc	Voc	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
	1:20-op-45292 1:20-op-45292	Theodora Oringher PC Yes Theodora Oringher PC Yes	Mylan Hikma		Yes Yes	1/31/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
		gilei i e				_, _,,	
			Novartis				
Ralls County, MO	1:20-op-45292	Theodora Oringher PC Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.		Yes	1/27/2023	
	1:20-op-45292	Theodora Oringher PC Yes	Indivior Michael Babich	No Vos	No		Natice of Valuntary Dismissal Without Projudice filed Enhance 24, 2022
Ralls County, Missouri	1:20-op-45292-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC Yes	ואווכוומפו סמטוכוו	Yes	No	1	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023

	•	T		•	•	•	1	
								Sawing Perfected on Mulan Institutional Inc. on 01/27/2022
							1/27/2022	Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
	4-00-				.,		1/27/2023	• Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Hickory County, Missouri	1:20-op-45295	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Hickory County, Missouri	1:20-op-45295	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
				Novartis				
Hickory County, MO	1:20-op-45295	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
	1:20-op-45295-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No	1,2,7,2020	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
	·	_						
								Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
			l				1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
New Madrid, Missouri	1:20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
New Madrid County (MO)	1:20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/28/2022	
New Madrid County, Missouri	1:20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
				Nevertic				
New Madrid County, MO	1:20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Ves	Yes	1/27/2023	
-	1:20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Indivior	No	103	1/2//2023	
New Madrid	1.20-0ρ-43230	Theodora Offigier FC	163	indivior	140			
County, Missouri	1:20-op-45296-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
,,								, - , - , - , - , - , - , - , - , - , -
								· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
							1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Adair County, Missouri	1:20-op-45297	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Adair County, Missouri	1:20-op-45297	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
				Novartis				
Adair County, MO	1:20-op-45297	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Adair County, Missouri	1:20-op-45297-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
								· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
							1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
-	1:20-op-45298	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Andrew County, Missouri	1:20-op-45298	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
	45000			Novartis	.,	.,	. /0= /0000	
Andrew County, MO	1:20-op-45298	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.		Yes	1/27/2023	
•	1:20-op-45298	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Indivior	No			
Andrew County, Missouri	1:20-op-45298-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
								· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
							1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Dekalb County, Missouri	1:20-op-45299	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Dekalb County, Missouri	1:20-op-45299	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
				Novartis				
DeKalb County, MO	1:20-op-45299	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.		Yes	1/27/2023	
DeKalb County, Missouri	1:20-op-45299-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
								Co. 1 - D. C. 1 - M. I
							1 /0= /0000	Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
Comments Comments and	4.20 45200	Therefore Ode 1 - 55	\v	NA: da a	W	V	1/27/2023	• Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Grundy County, Missouri	1:20-op-45300	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Grundy County, Missouri	1:20-op-45300	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
				Novartis				
Grundy County, MO	1:20-op-45300	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
		Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Hy-Vee	Yes		2/14/2023	
	1:20-op-45300	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Indivior	No			
			Yes	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
	1:20-op-45300-DAP	THEOGRAFIA OTHINGHELL C			1			
	1:20-op-45300-DAP							
-	1:20-op-45388	Fulmer Sill	Yes	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Harmon County, Oklahoma	·		Yes Yes	Mylan	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	3/16/2023 3/16/2023	
	1:20-op-45388	Fulmer Sill				Yes		

							-		
St. Clair County, MO v.					Pharmacy Buying				
Allergan PLC et al	1:21-op- 45044-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Appanoose County et al v.		Simmons Hanly Conroy,			Pharmacy Buying				
Allergan PLC, et al	1:21-op- 45051-DAP	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Association	No	Yes	7/17/2021	
					Louisiana Wholesale				
Ascension Parish School Board	1:21-op-45006	Leger & Shaw	No	3/1/2023	Drug	No			n/a
Ascension Parish School Board,		. 0.01		2/4/222		l.,	.,		Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Louisiana	1:21-op-45006	Leger & Shaw	No	3/1/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Ascension Parish School Board.									Descend Coming of short form amounted complaint with state court notition on registered agent for
	1:21-op-45006	Leger & Shaw	No	3/1/2023	Hilma	Voc	Yes	3/14/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Louisialla	1.21-0p-45006	Legel & Silaw	INO	5/1/2023	Пікіна	Yes	res	3/14/2022	service of process frade 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Ascension Parish School Board,									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
1	1:21-op-45006	Leger & Shaw	No	3/1/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
= -	2.22 op .5000		1	5, 2, 2020				0/20/2020	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
St. Bernard Parish School Board	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
St. Bernard Parish School Board	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Board, Louisiana	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School	4 24 45044	0.61	N .	2/22/2022	1121	lv.	W	2/44/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Board, Louisiana	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	нікта	Yes	Yes	3/14/2022	service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
					Associated				
					Pharmacies				
St. Bernard Parish, LA School					Inc/American				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Board	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
56.4	1.21 op 43014	20801 00 011011	1.10	2,23,2323	, issociated i narmatics			3/11/2023	SOLITION OF PROCESS THAT STATE THE
St. Bernard Parish School									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Board, LA	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
									· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
								1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
Barry County, Missouri	1:21-op-45016	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Barry County, Missouri	1:21-op-45016	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
					Novartis				
	1:21-op-45016	Theodora Oringher PC			Pharmaceuticals Corp.		Yes	1/27/2023	
<u> </u>	1:21-op-45016	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Indivior	No	NI.		Notice for London Production Park Its file In a 24 2022
Barry County, Missouri	1:21-op-45016-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
City of Elk City (OK)	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2022	Quest Pharmaceuticals	No	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No			No	163	3/10/2023	
	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No			No		0/10/2020	
,, -	- p			,, = ., = 525					
					Amneal				
City of Elk City, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Elk City, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023		Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Elk City, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023		Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
District Attorney of Clearfield					Ahold Delhaize USA,				
	1:21-op-45022	Levy, Baldante, Finney, &	k No	n/a	Inc.	Yes	Yes	9/8/2020	
District Attorney of Clearfield				1.					
	1:21-op-45022	Levy, Baldante, Finney, 8	k No	n/a	Giant Company, LLC	Yes	Yes	9/8/2020	
District Attorney of Clearfield									
County v. Purdue Pharma L.P.,	1.21 on 45022	Lover Boldants 51	No	2/2	Value Divis	Ves	Vas	0/15/2020	
et al City of Tulsa, OK	1:21-op-45022	Levy, Baldante, Finney, & Fulmer Sill	Yes	n/a	Value Drug GCP Pharma	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	9/15/2020 3/16/2023	
City Of Tuisd, UK	1:21-op-45024	Marc J. Bern & Partners,			GCF FIIdIIIId	162	162	3/10/2023	
Middletown Township PA	1:21-op-45030	LLP	No	3/21/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
adictowii Township rA	11.21 Ob-4000		1.10	3/21/2023	1	1	l .	1	

Middletown Township v. Teva	1								
Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et		Marc J. Bern & Partners,							
al.	1:21-op-45030	LLP	No	3/21/2023	Value Drug	Yes	No		Attempting to locate certified mail receipt for proof of service
Middletown Township,	·	Marc J. Bern & Partners,			Amneal				
Pennsylvania	1:21-op-45030	LLP	No	3/21/2023	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No		Attempting to locate certified mail receipt for proof of service
					Novartis				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Gramercy, LA	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Vec	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1.21-0p-43031	Ecger & Shaw	No	3/10/2023	Tharmaccaticals LLC	163	163	3/13/2023	Service of process made 5/14/2025. Exceded Neturn of Service med 3/15/2025.
					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023		Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Cramoray Lavisians	1.21 - 45024	Logor & Chou	No	2/16/2022	Louisiana Wholesale	No			
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Drug	No			n/a
T	4.24 45024	0.61		2/46/2022		W.	W	2/45/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Gramercy, LA	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Parish School Board	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Vac	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Farish School Board	1.21-υμ-43034	Legel & Silaw	INO	3/17/2023	Filarifiaceuticals LLC	163	ies	3/13/2023	Service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/13/2023.
					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
St. James Parish School Board	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Parish School Board	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Louisiana Wholesale	No			n/a
St. James Farish School Board	1.21-0p-43034	Legel & Silaw	INO	3/17/2023	Drug	NO			ily a
St. James Parish School Board,									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
LA	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
St. James Parish School Board,									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Louisiana	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
25 015 101 10	1.22 00 .300 .	zeger er en en		0,1.,2020			1.00	5, 15, 1525	50 VICE 61 P100000 MINUTES TO THE OUT OF THE OUT OUT OF THE OUT OF THE OUT OF THE OUT OF THE OUT OUT OF THE OUT OUT OUT OUT OUT OUT OUT OUT OUT OUT
St. James Parish School Board,									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Louisiana	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
					Novartis				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Lutcher, LA	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Lutcher, Louisiana	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Lutcher, Louisiana	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
				- / /				- / /	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Lutcher, Louisiana	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Hikma Louisiana Wholesale	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Lutcher, Louisiana	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023		No			n/a
,		-0		-,, - 020	U				
									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Lutcher, Louisiana	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Lutcher, LA	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
,				, ,					
					Amneal				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Lafourche Parish School Board	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.

	4.04			2/22/222	Amneal	.,	.,	0 /4 = /0 000	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Lafourche Parish School Board	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
	4.04	. 0.01		2/22/222	Louisiana Wholesale				
Lafourche Parish School Board	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Drug	No			n/a
Lafourche Parish School Board,				- / /	l				Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Louisiana	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board,									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Louisiana	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board,									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
LA	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
1									
1									· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
1								1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
	1:21-op-45044	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
St. Clair County, Missouri	1:21-op-45044	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
1									
1					Novartis				
	1:21-op-45044	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmaceuticals Corp.		Yes	1/27/2023	
St. Claire County, Missouri	1:21-op-45044-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
City of Stillwater, OK	1:21-op-45045	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
1									
City of Stillwater, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45045	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
1									
City of Stillwater, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45045	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Stilwater, OK	1:21-op-45045	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Altus, OK	1:21-op-45046	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Altus, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45046	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
City of Altus, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45046	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Atlus, OK	1:21-op-45046	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Appanoose County, IA	1:21op45051	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	7/9/2021	
,,	•	Simmons Hanly Conroy,						7/17/2021 for	
Appanoose County, et al., Iowa	1:21-op-45051	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes for West Ward	Westward	We sued West Ward
,,	•	Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Appanoose County, IA et al.	1:21-op-45051	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
, ,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Appanoose County, IA	1:21-OP-45051 (N.D. lo		No	11/18/2022	Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	7/7/2019	
,,,				, -, -	,			, ,	
Board of County									
Commissioners of the County		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
·	1:21-op-45055		No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	7/17/2021	
Board of County	1.21 op 45055		110	11/10/2022	Timeriu	163	163	7/17/2021	
Commissioners of the County		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:21-op-45055	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
or conax, mivi	1.21-0p-43033	LLC	140	11/10/2022	KVK-Tech	INO			
Board of County									
Commissioners of the County		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
·	1:21-op-45056		No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Voc	Vos	7/17/2021	
of Luna, New Mexico Board of County	1:21-0p-45056	LLC	INO	11/18/2022	ПІКІПА	Yes	Yes	//1//2021	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		S'							
Commissioners of the County		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
	1:21-op-45056	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Board of County		61							
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,	[11/10/2027			.,	2 /22 /222	100 M 1
Commissioners of the County		LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023	KVK also enterred their appearance in this case on 4/29/2021
· ·	1:21-op-45057	1				1	1	1	
of Union, NM	1:21-op-45057								
of Union, NM Board of County	·								
of Union, NM Board of County Commissioners of The County	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
of Union, NM Board of County Commissioners of The County of Union, New Mexico	·		No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	7/17/2021	
of Union, NM Board of County Commissioners of The County of Union, New Mexico City of Las Cruces, New	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022		Yes	Yes	7/17/2021	
of Union, NM Board of County Commissioners of The County of Union, New Mexico City of Las Cruces, New Mexico, a municipal	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No Yes	11/18/2022	Hikma Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC		Yes	7/17/2021 03/08/2023	

	T		1	I	T		1	
City of Calera, Alabama	1:21-op-45070	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Calera, Alabama	1:21-op-45070	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
The City of Calera, AL	1:21-op-45070	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
The City of Gatlinburg, TN	1:21-op-45071	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No		Indivior	Yes	In Process	PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
The County Board of Arlington County, Virginia v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.	1:21-op-45078	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.
The County Board of Arlington County, Virginia v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.	1:21-op-45078	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	No	Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.
The County Board of Arlington County, Virginia v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al. Texarkana Independent School	1:21-op-45078	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Amneal	Yes	No	Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served. Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
District, et al.	1:21-op-45080	The Coffman Law Firm	Yes		Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795.

				Amneal				
Texarkana Independent School				Pharmaceuticals of				Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
District, et al.	1:21-op-45080	The Coffman Law Firm	Yes	New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795.
exarkana Independent School		=1 0 55 1 =1	l.,	Amneal	l.,			Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
District, et al.	1:21-op-45080	The Coffman Law Firm	Yes	Pharmaceuticals, In	c. Yes	In Process		fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795.
		Levin Papantonio	l.,		l.,		7/04/0004	Different Case Number Format Used by Defendants - Per Pacer there is no document with case no
City of Niceville, FL	1:21-op-45081	Rafferty	Yes	Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	7/21/2021	21-45801. The correct Case number for Niceville is 1:21-op-45081
o		Levin Papantonio	l.,	Amneal	_		00/10/0000	
City of Niceville, FL	1:21-op-45081	Rafferty	Yes	Pharmaceuticals LL	C Yes	Yes	03/10/2023	
				Associated				
City of Niceville, Florida v.				Pharmacies				
Amerisourcebergn Drug		Levin Papantonio		Inc/American				
	1:21-op-45081	Rafferty	Yes	Associated Pharma	cies Yes	Yes	02/24/2023	
•	· ·	Levin Papantonio					, ,	Different Case Number Format Used by Defendants - Per Pacer there is no document with case no
Niceville, FL	1:21-op-45081	Rafferty	Yes	Alvogen	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	3:21-45801
Pinal County, Arizona	1:21-op-45088	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, In	c. Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Pinal County, AZ	1:21-op-45088	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Indivior	No No	163	2, 11, 2023	
Pinal County, AZ	1:21-op-45088-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
r mai County, AZ	1.21-0h-43000-DAP	Bahe Cook Cantley &	163	Sanuoz IIIC.	163	162	1/2//2023	
		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn	1					
City of Duccoll Mantucker at al	1:21 on 45004		No.	2/1/2022	Voc	Voc	7/6/2021	
City of Russell, Kentucky et al.	1:21-op-45094	Law Bahe Cook Cantley &	No	2/1/2023 Hikma	Yes	Yes	7/0/2021	
City of December 1		· ·						
City of Russell, Kentucky, et al.	4 24 45004	Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn	N	Amneal		V	7/2/2024	
v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.	1:21-op-45094	Law	No	2/1/2023 Pharmaceuticals, In	c. Yes	Yes	7/2/2021	
City of Russell, Kentucky; City of Jenkins, Kentucky; City of Pineville, Kentucky; City of Worthington, Kentucky; City of Vanceburg, Kentucky; City of				2/1/23, 1/31/23,				
Greenup, Kentucky; City of		Bahe Cook Cantley &		1/31/23, 1/25/23,				
South Shore, Kentucky; City of		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn		1/25/23, 1/31/23,				
Bellefonte, Kentucky	1:21-op-45094	Law	No	1/31/23, 1/26/23 Mylan	Yes	Yes	7/2/2021	
		Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn						
City of Russell, KY et al.	1:21-op-45094	Law	No	2/1/2023 KVK-Tech	No			
city of Russell, KT et al.	1.21-0p-43034	Law	INO	2/1/2023 RVR-TECH	INO			
City of Brewton, Alabama and		Riley & Jackson, P.C.						
City of Semmes, Alabama	1:21-op-45113		No	10/27/2022 Hikma	No			
City of Brewton; City of		Riley & Jackson, P.C.						
Semmes, Alabama	1:21-op-45113		No	10/27/2022 Mylan	No			
City of Millbrook; City of					1			
Wetumpka, Alabama	1:21-op-45135	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022 Mylan	No			
City of Millbrook, Alabama,								
and City of Wetumpka,			1		1			
	1:21-op-45135	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022 Hikma	No			
								Plaintiff's counsel submitted a service waiver to defense counsel on January 11, 2022. Defense counsel did not sign the waiver. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtaine
City of Fairhope, Alabama	1:22-op-45002	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022 Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
Tity of Eairhona Alahama	1:22 on 45002	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022 Mulan	No			
City of Fairhope, Alabama	1:22-op-45002		No	10/27/2022 Mylan	No			
Elmore County, Alabama and				40 (00 (000))				Plaintiff's counsel submitted a service waiver to defense counsel on January 13, 2022. Defense counsel did not sign the waiver. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained
	1:22-op-45003	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022 Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
Elmore County, Alabama; Randolph County, Alabama			1					
	1:22-op-45003	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022 Mylan	No			

	1		1				T		
Board of County									
Commissioners of the County		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
of Torrance, NM	1:22-op-45004	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
City of East Brewton, Alabama	1·22-on-45005	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2	2022 Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel submitted a service waiver to defense counsel on February 1, 2022. Defense counsel did not sign the waiver. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Last Brewton, Alabama	1.22-0β-43003	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	INO	10/28/2	LOZZ I IIKIII d	163	III Trocess	III Frocess	a summons from the clerk of court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of East Brewton, Alabama	1:22 on 45005	Miey & Jackson, F.C.	No	10/29/2	2022 Mylan	No			
City of East Brewton, Alabama	1.22-0β-43003	Simon Greenstone	110	10/28/2	Amneal	140			
County of Coryell, Texas	1:22-op-45009	Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2	2023 Pharmaceuticals LI	LC Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
country of corycli, rexus	1.22 Op 43003	r dridder, r .c.	110	2,11,2	1 Harmaccaticals El	LC TC3	1111100033		Waiver of service of summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2025.
		Simon Greenstone			Amneal				
County of Coryell, Texas	1:22-op-45009	Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2	2023 Pharmaceuticals, I	nc. Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Simon Greenstone		, ,					, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
County of Coryell, Texas	1:22-op-45009	Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2	2023 Mylan	No			
	,	Simon Greenstone		1					
County of Coryell, TX	1:22-op-45009	Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2	2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
		Simon Greenstone			Amneal				
County of Kendall, Texas	1:22-op-45010	Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2	2023 Pharmaceuticals LI	LC Yes	Yes		Served on 9/16/21
		Simon Greenstone			Amneal				
County of Kendall, Texas	1:22-op-45010	Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2	2023 Pharmaceuticals, I	nc. Yes	Yes		Served on 9/16/21
		Simon Greenstone							
County of Kendall, Texas	1:22-op-45010	Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2	2023 Mylan	No			
		Simon Greenstone							
County of Kendall, TX	1:22-op-45010	Panatier, P.C.	No		2023 Sandoz/Novartis	No			
City of Roanoke, Alabama	1:22-op-45011	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No		2022 Hikma	No			
City of Roanoke, Alabama	1:22-op-45011	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2	2022 Mylan	No			
		Wallace Jordan Ratliff &							
City of Irondale, AL	1:22-op-45012	Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2	2022 Indivior	No			
l.,		Wallace Jordan Ratliff &							
City of Irondale, Alabama	1:22-op-45012	Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2	2022 Mylan	No			
		Wallace Jordan Ratliff &							
City of Irondale, Alabama	1:22-op-45012	Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2	2022 Hikma	No			
City of Alabana Al	4.22 45042	Wallace Jordan Ratliff &		10/20/2	2022				
City of Alabaster, AL	1:22-op-45013	Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2	2022 Indivior	No			
City of Alabaster, Alabama	1:22-op-45013	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/20/2	2022 Hikma	No			
City Of Alabastel, Alaballia	1.22-0p-43013	Wallace Jordan Ratliff &	INO	10/28/2	LUZZ I IINIII a	No			
City of Alabaster, Alabama	1:22-op-45013	Brandt LLC	No	10/29/2	2022 Mylan	No			
on madaster, madarid	2.22 op 43013	Wallace Jordan Ratliff &		10/20/2		1,10			
City of Bessemer, AL	1:22-op-45014	Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2	2022 Indivior	No			
and a second fire	op 15011	Wallace Jordan Ratliff &	1	10/20/2		1			
City of Bessemer, Alabama	1:22-op-45014	Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2	2022 Hikma	No			
, , , , , , ,	1	Wallace Jordan Ratliff &		-77-					
City of Bessemer, Alabama	1:22-op-45014	Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2	2022 Mylan	No			
	·	Simmons Hanly Conroy,						Defendant filed its Notice of Appearace prior to service of the	e e
Eddy County, NM	1:22-op-45015	LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	complaint	Defendant filed its Notice of Appearace prior to service of the complaint
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Eddy County, New Mexico	1:22-op-45015	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	5/23/2022	

City of Clanton, AL, City of Columbiana, AL, City of Helena, AL, City of Pelham, AL	1:22-op-45016	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023 Indivior	Yes	In Process		PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Clanton, Alabama; City of Columbiana, Alabama; City								PFS Explaination: The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier
of Helena, Alabama; City of		Friedman, Dazzio &		2 (2 (2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2				reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants
Pelham, Alabama	1:22-op-45016	Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023 Mylan	Yes	In Process		before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Clanton Alabama	1.22 on 45016	Friedman, Dazzio &	No	Hilmon	Vos			
City of Clanton, Alabama City of Saraland, Alabama	1:22-op-45016 1:22-op-45017	Zulanas, P.C. Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No No	Hikma 10/28/2022 Mylan	Yes No			
City of Saraland, Alabama	1:22-op-45017	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022 Hikma	No			
City of Saraiand, Alabama	1.22-0p-43017	Kiley & Jackson, F.C.	INO	10/20/2022	INO			
City of Bay Minette, Alabama, et al.	1:22-op-45018	Montgomery Ponder,	Yes	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023	Sent Request for Wavier of Service to Paul Cosgrove, attorney for Amneal Phramaceuticals LLC, on 05/09/2022, 06/28/2022, 03/01/2023, and 03/15/2023. No response received. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc. 21] and personal service is being attempted.
		Montgomery Ponder,						
Bay Minette, AL	1:22-op-45018	LLC	Yes	Winn-Dixie	No			
		Jinks, Crow & Dickson,						
City of Gulf Shores, AL	1:22-op-45019	P.C.	No	2/21/2023 Indivior	Yes	In Process		Transferred to the MDL prior to service being perfected. Service is being attempted now.
		Jinks, Crow & Dickson,						
City of Gulf Shores, Alabama	1:22-op-45019	P.C.	No	2/21/2023 Mylan	Yes	In Process		Transferred to the MDL prior to service being perfected. Service is being attempted now.
The City Of Gulf Shores,		Jinks, Crow & Dickson,						
Alabama	1:22-op-45019	P.C.	No	2/21/2023 Hikma	Yes	In Process		Transferred to the MDL prior to service being perfected. Service is being attempted now.
City of Childersburg, AL	1:22-op-45020-DAP	Montgomery Ponder,	Yes	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes		Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc. 22] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 24].
2, 0. 0aciobaig, AL		1-2-5	1.00	Sandoz Inc.		103		
Board of Education of Boardman Local Schools and Board of Education of Liberty Local Schools, Individually, And On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated v. Cephalon Inc., et al.	1:22-op-45023	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
								Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Board of Education of Boardman Local Schools, Ohio; Board of Education of Liberty		Mahri 9 Chalat BU C	Vos	landar.	Vac	In Director		fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Boardman Local Schools, Ohio;	1:22-op-45023	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Boardman Local Schools, Ohio; Board of Education of Liberty	1:22-op-45023	Mehri & Skalet PLLC Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Mylan KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were

Southwestern Central School							Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
District, New York	1:22-op-45024	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
							Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Putnam County School Board,							fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Florida	1:22-op-45025	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Putnam County School Board							
Individually and On Behalf of							Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
All Others Similarly Situated v							fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Cephalon Inc., et al.	1:22-op-45025	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
							Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Hamblen County Board of							fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Education (TN)	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Hambles County Board of							Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Hamblen County Board of Education (TN)	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Quest Pharmaceutical	s Vos	In Process	fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Education (TN)	1.22-0p-43027	IVIEIIII & SKAIEL FLLC	163	Quest Filaililaceutica	3 163	III Flocess	Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Hancock County Bd. of Ed, WV	1·22-on-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Keysource Medical	Yes	In Process	fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795.
Transcock County Bu. of Eu, 111	1.22 op 43027	Wienin & Skaret i EEe	163	Reysource Medical	103	III I I Geess	Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Hancock County Board of							fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Education (TN)	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
, ,							Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Hancock County Board of							fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Education (TN)	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Quest Pharmaceutica	s Yes	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Hancock County Board of Education and Hamblen County Board of Education Individually, and On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated v.							Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Cephalon Inc., et al.	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Hancock County Board of	·						·
Education, Tennessee;							Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Hamblen County Board of							fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Education, Tennessee	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Marion County Bd. of Ed, WV	1:22-op-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Kevsource Medical	Yes	In Process	Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795.
Marion County Board of	1:22-0p-45028	Menin & Skalet PLLC	res	Reysource Medical	res	III Process	fact sneet, and the court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 25, 5795.
Education, West Virginia; Wyoming County Board of Education, West Virginia; Kanawha County Board of Education, West Virginia; McDowell County Board of							Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Education, West Virginia	1:22-op-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Mylan	Yes	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
	1						Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Marion County Board of				Masters			fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
Education, WV	1:22-op-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Marion County Board of Education, Wyoming County Board of Education, Kanawha County Board of Education, McDowell County Board of							
Education WV, Individually and					1		
On Behalf of All Others					1		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
					1		fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
					IV.c.c	In Process	served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Inc., et al.	1:22-op-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	KVK-Tech	Yes	III FIOCESS	Serveu on rep. 23, 2023.
Similarly Situated v. Cephalon Inc., et al. Susanville Elementary School District, California; Lassen County Office of Education,	1:22-op-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes	KVK-Tech	res	III FI OCESS	Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were

	1					•	ı	
Cusanuilla Flamantanu Cabaal								
Susanville Elementary School								
District, Lassen County Office								
of Education CA, Individually								
and On Behalf of All Others								Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of th
Similarly Situated v. Cephalon								fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers w
nc., et al.	1:22-op-45031	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	No	1/2/2023 KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		served on Feb. 23, 2023.
		Harrison Davis Morrison						
McLennan County	17-op-45075	Jones	No	2/16/2023 Target Corporation	No			
		Harrison Davis Morrison						
McLennan County, TX	17-OP-45075	Jones	No	2/16/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
Mora County, NM	17-OP-45080	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Hospira	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
.,,		Simmons Hanly Conroy,					, , , , , ,	
Avoyelles Parish Sheriff, LA	17-OP-45164	LLC	No	1/3/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
Douglas Anderson (Avoyelles	17 01 43104	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	140	1/3/2023 WOTTS & DICKSOTT	140			
, ,	17-OP-45164	LLC	No	1/3/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
Farisii Sileriii)	17-UP-45104	LLC	NO		INO			
				Auburn				
	17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm		Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed on 02/21/2023
Hilton (Rapides Parish Sheriff),		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
.A	17-OP-45178	LLC	No	1/3/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
Mancuso (Calcasieu Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
Sheriff), LA	17-OP-45179	LLC	No	1/3/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
Garber (Lafayette Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
Sheriff), LA	17-OP-45180	LLC	No	1/3/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
Humphreys County, MS	18-OP-45021	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
	10 01 10021							Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
City of Lansing, MI	18-OP-45054	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
city of Lansing, ivii	16-07-43034	Weitz & Euxemberg	NO	12/1/2022 COSECO	163	163	2/1/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
Consideration of the Constant Man	10.00.45056	\\\\-i+= \Q_1 \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	N-	12/1/2022 (V	V	2/7/2040	
Grand Traverse County, MI	18-OP-45056	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
								On June 12, 2018, a Notice of Non-suit was filed as to Abbott Laboratories, only. On March 16,
		Harrison Davis Morrison						2023, this client refiled a Notice of Non-suit as to Abbott Laboratories, only. As such, any
Nolan County, TX	18-op-45061	Jones	No	Abbott	No			complaints as to service of process are moot.
								On June 12, 2018, a Notice of Non-suit was filed as to Abbott Laboratories, only. On March 16,
		Harrison Davis Morrison						2023, this client refiled a Notice of Non-suit as to Abbott Laboratories, only. As such, any
Mitchell County, TX	18-op-45063	Jones	No	Abbott	No			complaints as to service of process are moot.
.,,		Harrison Davis Morrison						
County of Wichita, TX	18-OP-45064	Jones	No	2/16/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
edunity or vitalita, 12	10 01 13001	301163	110	2/10/2023 (1/10/11) & DICKSON	110			Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
Chinnows County MI	18-OP-45066	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
Chippewa County, MI	16-UP-45000	Weitz & Luxeliberg	NO	12/1/2022 COSECO	165	163	2/1/2016	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
							. /- /	
Delta County, MI	18-OP-45067	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
								Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
City of Escanaba, MI	18-OP-45068	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
		Harrison Davis Morrison						
Polk County, TX	18-OP-45077	Jones	No	2/16/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
								Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
Saginaw County, MI	18-OP-45082	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
		The state of a state of the sta		, -,	1.55	1.55	-7.7-5-5	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
Genesee County, MI	18-OP-45083	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
defiesee county, wii	10-01-43003	Weitz & Luxeliberg	NO	12/1/2022 COSECO	163	163	2/1/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
21 f D	10.00.45004			42/4/2022		v	2/7/2040	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
City of Detroit, MI	18-OP-45084	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
								Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
·	18-OP-45085	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
eal (Washington Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
heriff), LA	18-OP-45093	LLC	No	1/3/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
Voods (Jefferson Davis Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
heriff), LA	18-OP-45099	LLC	No	1/3/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
- 7		-		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
Roscommon County, MI	18-OP-45102	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
noscommon county, IVII	10-01 43102	AACUT OF FRVCUINCIR		12/1/2022 (0310)	103	103	2/1/2010	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
Marguetta County Ad	10 OD 4546 :	Moite O Lines Lines	No	12/1/2022 (+-	Voc	Vo-	2/7/2046	
Marquette County, MI	18-OP-45104	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
								Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
			1		IV.c.	lsz.	0 /= /0040	Increased on 2/7/10
Crawford County, MI	18-OP-45105	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
Crawford County, MI	18-OP-45105	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	res	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.

									Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service
Mason County, MI	18-OP-45112	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	perfected on 2/7/18.
Manistee County, MI	18-OP-45113	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Craft (Vernon Parish Sheriff),	10-01-43113	Simmons Hanly Conroy,		12/1/2022	Costco	163	163	2/1/2010	perfected on 2777 10.
LA "	18-OP-45140	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
									On June 12, 2018, a Notice of Non-suit was filed as to Abbott Laboratories, only. On March 16,
		Harrison Davis Morrison							2023, this client refiled a Notice of Non-suit as to Abbott Laboratories, only. As such, any
Throckmorton County, TX	18-op-45141	Jones Simmons Hanly Conroy,	No		Abbott	No			complaints as to service of process are moot.
Hebert (Allen Parish Sheriff)	18-OP-45142	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Richardson (Sabine Parish	10 01 43142	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	140	1/3/2023	WOTTS & BICKSOTT	140			
Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45143	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Russell (Ouachita Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45154	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
		Sanders Phillips							
Municipality of		Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson							
Guayanilla, PR	18-OP-45176	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		
Soileau (Evangeline Parish	10 01 10170	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	1.00						
Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45189	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Summers County									Summers County has participated in a global settlement with regard to the State of West Virginia
Commission, MD	18-OP-45226	Wooton, Davis, Hussell &		N/A	Richie Pharmacal	Yes	No	N/A	and pursuant to MOA
		Harrison Davis Morrison		- / - / /-					
Childress County, TX	18-OP-45229	Jones	No	2/16/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			On home 12, 2010, a Nation of Name with one filed as to Abbett Laboratories and a On March 16
		Harrison Davis Morrison							On June 12, 2018, a Notice of Non-suit was filed as to Abbott Laboratories, only. On March 16, 2023, this client refiled a Notice of Non-suit as to Abbott Laboratories, only. As such, any
Kinney County, TX	18-op-45241	Jones	No		Abbott	Yes			complaints as to service of process are moot.
Williams (East Carroll Parish	10 00 13211	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	110		Abbott	163			complaints as to service of process are mode.
Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45259	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Philley (West Carroll Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45260	LLC	No		Morris & Dickson	No			
County of Tarrant	18-OP-45274	Lanier Law Firm	No	10/28/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
									Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have
		Bossier & Associates,							re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does
City of Philadelphia, MS	18-OP-45279	PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Morris & Dickson	No	No		not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Filliadelphia, Wis	16-OF-43279	FLLC	INO	2/14/2023	WOTTS & DICKSOIT	NO	NO		not run against this municipal Flamtin, and thus, the case can be remed in required.
									A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other
									subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established
									by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs
									bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that
									Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As
Gratiot County, MI	18-OP-45339	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
									A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other
									subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established
									by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs
									bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that
									Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As
Alcona County, MI	18-OP-45340	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
									A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other
									subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established
									by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs
									bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that
Aronac County MI	19 OD 45241	Moitz & Luyonhora	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Vos	Voc	9/20/2019	Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As
Arenac County, MI	18-OP-45341	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	COSTCO	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
									A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other
									subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established
									by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs
									bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that
	1	ı	I	1	1	I			
									Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As

			1					
losco County, MI	18-OP-45343	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
								A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As
City of Iron Mountain, MI	18-OP-45344	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As
Ostego County, MI Montmorency County, MI	18-OP-45345	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No No	12/1/2022 Costco 12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018 8/30/2018	such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed. A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Ogemaw County, MI	18-OP-45348	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Isabella County, MI	18-OP-45349	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Shiawassee County, MI	18-OP-45350	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Lenawee County, MI	18-OP-45351	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Sanilac County, MI	18-OP-45352	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.

								A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs
Antrim County, MI	18-OP-45354	OP-45354 Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Hillsdale County, MI	18-OP-45355	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
ienzie County, MI	18-OP-45356	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Oceana County, MI	18-OP-45357	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Osceola County, MI	18-OP-45359	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
	18-OP-45360			12/1/2022 Costco			8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As
Alger County, MI Baraga County, MI	18-OP-45361	Weitz & Luxenberg Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed. A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
uce County, MI	18-OP-45362	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Wexford County, MI	18-OP-45364	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.

18-OP-45366 18-OP-45368	Weitz & Luxenberg Napoli Shkolnik	No Yes	12/1/2022 Costco Richie Pharmacal	Yes No	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
18-OP-45369	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Richie Pharmacal	No			
18-OP-45370	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes	Richie Pharmacal	No			
18-op-45377	Wiggins Childs Pantazis	Fi No		n No			
18-op-45390	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Defendant entered an appearance on 10/7/2020 and 12/12/2022
							A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As
18-OP-45406	Weitz & Luxenberg	No		Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
10 OD 45443	D'Amara Law Crawa B	CINA		Vas	Ves	7/12/2010	Waiver of Service filed with the court on 7/12/2019. Doc No. 28.
16-UP-45442	D Amore Law Group, P.	C. NO	11/21/22 COSCCO	res	ies	7/12/2019	waiver of Service filed with the court of 7/12/2019. Doc No. 28.
			2/7/2023 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22 but resent on 2/7/23 after not being place				
18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.	C. No	in repository in 11/22 SuperValu	No			
18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.	C. No	counsel on 11/21/22 but resent on 2/7/23 after not being place	n No			
18-op-45444			Pharmaceutical	No			Dismissed 02/21/2023
10 45 400		N-	42/42/2022 INA Contib	V	V	4/25/2010	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/13/20.
18-op-45490	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	NO	12/13/2022 JW Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/13/20.
	Lillis Law Firm & Tonry						
18-OP-45492	**		3/20/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
			7, 7, 1	-			
18-OP-45517	Zulanas, P.C.	Yes	Morris & Dickson	Yes	In Process		
			Auburn				
18-op-45593	Bryant Law Center Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,	Yes	Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		
10 45616		N-	44 /40 /2022 41 4 11	V	In December		Danidada Danasa Camana ay 2/24/2022
18-0p-45616		NO	11/18/2022 Abbott	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
10 OD 45C1C	Olstein, Brody &	No	11 /19 /2022 Cookea	Vas	In Drange		Provided to Process Someon on 2/24/2022
10-UF-43010		INU	11/18/2022 COSICO	162	III Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
18-OP-45715	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Morris & Dickson	No			
18-OP-45756	Law Office of David W. Gernhauser, Jr., LLC	Yes	3/27/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
10 on 45040	The Finnell Firm	No		Vas	Vas	2/46/2022	Defendant enterd appearances on 10/7/2020 and 12/42/2022
18-op-45819	THE FINNEII FIRM	INO	IN/A Pharmaceutical	res	res	2/16/2023	Defendant enterd appearances on 10/7/2020 and 12/12/2022
18-op-45820	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A SuperValu	No			
	18-OP-45368 18-OP-45369 18-OP-45369 18-OP-45370 18-OP-45377 18-OP-45390 18-OP-45406 18-OP-45442 18-OP-45442 18-OP-45442 18-OP-45444 18-OP-454490 18-OP-45517 18-OP-45517 18-OP-45616 18-OP-45616 18-OP-45715	18-OP-45368 Napoli Shkolnik 18-OP-45369 Napoli Shkolnik 18-OP-45370 Napoli Shkolnik 18-op-45377 Wiggins Childs Pantazis 18-op-45390 The Finnell Firm 18-op-45390 The Finnell Firm 18-op-45442 D'Amore Law Group, P. 18-op-45442 D'Amore Law Group, P. 18-op-45444 Skinner Law Firm Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Lillis Law Firm & Tonry, Brinson, & Glorioso Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C. 18-op-45517 Zulanas, P.C. 18-op-45593 Bryant Law Center Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & 18-op-45616 Agnello, P.C. Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & 18-OP-45616 Agnello, P.C. Law Office of David W. Garrard & Ashley, P.C. Law Office of David W. Gernhauser, Jr., LLC 18-op-45819 The Finnell Firm	18-OP-45368 Napoli Shkolnik Yes 18-OP-45369 Napoli Shkolnik Yes 18-OP-45370 Napoli Shkolnik Yes 18-op-45377 Wiggins Childs Pantazis Fi No 18-op-45390 The Finnell Firm No 18-op-45390 The Finnell Firm No 18-op-45406 Weitz & Luxenberg No 18-op-45442 D'Amore Law Group, P.C. No 18-op-45442 D'Amore Law Group, P.C. No 18-op-45444 Skinner Law Firm Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 18-op-45490 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No Lillis Law Firm & Tonry, Brinson, & Glorioso No Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C. Yes 18-OP-45517 Zulanas, P.C. Yes 18-op-45593 Bryant Law Center Yes 18-op-45616 Agnello, P.C. No 18-op-45616 Agnello, P.C. No 18-OP-45715 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 18-OP-45715 Garrard & Ashley, P.C. No 18-OP-45716	18-OP-45368	18-OP-45368 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No 18-OP-45370 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No 18-OP-45370 Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Napoli Shkolnik Yes Richie Pharmacal No Richie Pha	13.0P-45368	So Pass See Napol Shidnish Yes Richie Pharmacal No

Bon Secours Health System,									
Inc.; Bon Secours-Richmond									
Community Hospital,									
Incorporated; Bon Secours									
DePaul Medical Center, Inc.;									
Bon Secours-Memorial									
Regional Medical Center, Inc.;									
Bon Secours-St. Francis									
Medical Center, Inc.; Bon									
Secours-St. Mary's Hospital of									
Richmand, Inc.; Bon Secourse-									
Virginia Healthsource, Inc.;									
_									
Chesapeake Hospital									
Corporation; Mary Immaculate									
Hospital, Incorporated,							.,	. / /	
Maryview Hospital	18-op-45820	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Apotex	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
					Auburn				
Bon Secours Health System, VA	18-op-45820	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Defendant enterd appearances on 10/7/2020 and 12/12/2022
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Wiley (Ascension Parish Sheriff)	18-OP-45842	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Tubbs (Morehouse Parish		Simmons Hanly Conroy,							
Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45884	LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
									Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/30/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is
									inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/28/18. The docket
Ontongon County, MI	18-OP-45893	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
									Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/30/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is
									inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/28/18. The docket
Presque Isle County, MI	18-OP-45894	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		- J		, ,					Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/30/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is
									inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/28/18. The docket
St. Clair County, MI	18-OP-45896	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
Ser Sian Sparity, iii	10 01 43030	Trentz & zaxenserg		12, 1, 2022	000100	1.00	1.03	3/4/2010	Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/31/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is
									inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/29/18. The docket
Traverse City, MI	18-OP-45901	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
Traverse City, Wil	18-01-45501	Weitz & Luxemberg	NO	12/1/2022	COSICO	163	163	3/4/2018	Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/31/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is
									inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/29/18. The docket
City of East Lansing MI	10 OD 45002	Woitz & Luvenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costso	Vos	Voc	9/4/2018	shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
City of East Lansing, MI	18-OP-45902	Weitz & Luxenberg	INU	12/1/2022	Cosico	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	· ·
									Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/31/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is
									inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/29/18. The docket
City of Westland, MI	18-OP-45903	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
									Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/31/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is
									inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/29/18. The docket
City of Jackson, MI	18-OP-45904	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
		Sanders Phillips							
		Grossman, LLC AKA							
		Milberg Coleman Bryson							
Hudson County, NJ	18-op-45937	Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Abbott	No	In Process		
		Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,							
		Olstein, Brody &							
Jersey City, NJ	18-op-45948	Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Abbott	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
		Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,							
		Olstein, Brody &							
Jersey City, NJ	18-OP-45948	Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Costco	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
, , ,				, -,					
									Curative service and waiver sent to Defense counsel Amy Fiterman on behalf of Target Stores, Inc.
									as per the template filed 6/17/2019 (ECF 1687-1) and amended per counsel's currrent contact
City of Huntington, WV	18-op-45984	Motley Rice	Yes	2/27/2022	Target Corporation	Yes	In Process		information as filed on Target's Amended Status Report (ECF No. 4942).
City of Hullington, WV		HAIORIEA LICE	1 C3	3/2//2023	ranger corporation	162	111 1 1 0 0 0 3 3		information as fred on ranger's American status heport (LCF No. 4542).
	10-0p-43304								
	10-0p-45304	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,							
Essex County, NJ	18-op-45989		No	11/18/2022	Abbott	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.

		Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,						
		Olstein, Brody &						
Essex County, NJ	18-OP-45989	Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022 Costco	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
City of Laredo, TX	18-OP-46026	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022 Morris & Dickson	Yes	Yes	2/9/2023	110Vided to 110cess Servers on 2/24/2025.
sity of Edicao, TX	10 01 40020	Napon Shkomik	110	12/20/2022 (WOTTS & DICKSOTT	103	163	2/3/2023	PFS was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022.
Guidroz (St. Landry		Neblett, Beard &						Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS
Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-46051	Arsenault	Yes	Morris & Dickson	No			repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.
, 2.	10 01 40031	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	1.00	Auburn				10000001 011 01 0100110 20/ 20/ 2022 00 22/200111
Adams Cty, ID	18-op-46062	LLC	No	11/18/2022 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	6/5/2019	
	10 00 10002		1.10	12/20/2022		1.00	0,0,000	
								The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states
Opelousas General		Neblett, Beard &						that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a
Hospital Authority, LA	18-OP-46083	Arsenault	No	Morris & Dickson	No			PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Wolfe Co., KY	18-OP-46099	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Richie Pharmacal	No			
<u> </u>								
Monmouth County, NJ	18-op-46118	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023 Abbott	No			
	·	, i						
								The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states
aSalle Parish Hospital,		Neblett, Beard &						that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a
Hardtner Medical Center, LA	18-OP-46150	Arsenault	No	Morris & Dickson	No			PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a PFS. "
								Assertio Therapeutics, Inc. and Assertio Holdings, Inc. Assertio is f/k/a Depomed, Inc. and Depome
Carroll County, GA	18-op-46269	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Assertio	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Waiver was perfected 5/15/2018
		Simmons Hanly Conroy,		Auburn				
Canyon County, ID	18-op-46277	LLC	No	11/18/2022 Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/31/2019	
City of Bogalusa, LA	18-OP-46297	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Morris & Dickson	No			
								PFS was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022.
		Neblett, Beard &						Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS
City of Eunice, LA	18-OP-46328	Arsenault	Yes	Morris & Dickson	No			repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.
Mental Health & Recovery								
Services Board of Allen,								
Auglaize and Hardin Counties		Spangenberg Shibley &						
(OH)	18-op-46344	Liber	No	Prescription Supply	Yes			dismissed 3/27/23
Gilley (Richland Parish Sheriff),		Simmons Hanly Conroy,						
LA	19-OP-45007	LLC	No	1/3/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Donaldsonville,								
LA	19-OP-45028	Leger & Shaw	Yes	Morris & Dickson	No			
Kentucky River District Health								
Department	19-op-45050	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A UCB	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Defendant entered an appearance on 1/10/2022
Kentucky River Dist. Health				Auburn				
Dept, KY	19-op-45050	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Defendant entered an appearance on 10/7/2020 and 12/12/2022
Harrison County, MS	19-OP-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/4/19.
Pulaski County, GA	19-op-45176	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Apotex	Yes	Yes	9/4/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
		Blasingame, Burch,						Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/4/19.
Stephens County, GA	19-op-45195	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Apotex	Yes	Yes	9/4/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
		O'Leary, Shelton,						
		Corrigan, Peterson,			[
City of Memphis, TN	19-OP-45220	Dalton & Quillin, LLC	No	11/18/2022 Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Waiver Signed by Defendant on 2/16/23
					1			PFS was re-served pursant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022.
McCain (Grant Parish		Neblett, Beard &						Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS
Sheriff), LA	19-OP-45244	Arsenault	Yes	Morris & Dickson	No			repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.
								The case was removed pre-service. Once the case was removed to federal court, it was stayed
				1	1			pending transfer to the MDL. Since that time, we have had no communications regarding service o
Buchanan County, VA	19-op-45253	Street Law Firm	Yes	Abbott	Yes			process on Abbott.
					1			
								Service was perfected by waiver only three days late, under the standard 90 days afforded by the
					1			FRCP. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing
onia County, MI	19-OP-45261	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	7/11/2019	the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by the three day delay.
					1			
								Service was perfected by waiver only three days late, under the standard 90 days afforded by the
					1			FRCP. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing
Livingston County, MI	19-OP-45262	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022 Costco	Yes	Yes	7/11/2019	the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by the three day delay.
		Blasingame, Burch,			1			Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 8/2/19.
ayette County, GA	19-OP-45293	Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022 Alvogen	Yes	Yes	8/2/2019	Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
	1		1		I			
	19-OP-45294		Yes	l l	Yes	In Process		

City of Prestonsburg	19-op-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes	UCB	Yes	In Process		
City of Prestonsburg, KY	19-OP-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Alvogen	Yes	In Process		
				Auburn				
City of Prestonsburg, KY	19-op-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		
City of Prestonsburg, KY	19-OP-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Richie Pharmacal	Yes	In Process		
Dutley County MO: Com-								
Butler County, MO; Cape								
Girardeau County, MO; Christian County, MO; City of								
Independence, MO; City of								
Joplin, MO; Crawford County,								
MO; Dent County, MO;								
Dunklin County, MO; Greene								
County, MO; Iron County, MO;								
Jasper County, MO; Madison								
County, MO; Perry County,								
MO; Ste. Genevieve County,								
MO; Stone County, MO; Taney					1			
County, MO; Texas County,		Stranch, Jennings &			1			
MO; Washington County, MO	19-op-45371	Garvey PLLC	No	2/21/2023 Assertio	Yes	No		This Defendant has been dismissed.
Union County All	10 on 45374	Kanner O M/h:t-l 110	No	2/14/2022 455	No			
Union County, NJ	19-op-45374	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023 Abbott	No			
					1			Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the
		Sanford Heisler Sharp,			1			Defendant but did not receive a response. After conferring with Defendant's counsel, Defendant
Jefferson County, NY	19-op-45437	LLP	Yes	Abbott	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	has recently agreed to waive service, and subdivision counsel has filed an executed waiver.
City of Inez	19-op-454499	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Zydus	Yes	In Process	2,2.,2020	
Chatham County, NC; City of		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
Canton, NC	19-OP-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	10/1/2019	
City of Canton, NC	19-OP-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Richie Pharmacal	No			
				Auburn				
City of Canton, NC	19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	10/10/2019	
City of Inez, KY	19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Apotex	Yes	In Process		
City of Inez, KY	19-OP-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Richie Pharmacal	Yes	In Process		
City of last 100	19-OP-45499	Danier to Laur Canatan	V	Com Dhanna a cutinala	V	La Dunnana		
City of Inez, KY	19-OP-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		Documents are out for service with the Clerk of the Court. Waiver of service was sent on 9/18/2019
								to counsel of record, Nicholas Upfal,but no response was ever received. Service by Clerk. Summons
				11/29/2022 - sent to				and Complaint addressed to Auburn Pharmaceutical Company placed in U.S. Mail. Type of service:
				PFS counsel on Auburn				Certified Mail. Receipt # 9314 7699 0430 0104 6169 37. (F,ML) (Entered: 03/03/2023) - Docket No.
Cty. of Curry, OR	19-op-45512	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/21/22 Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		43
	·	·		10/29/2019 &				
City of Long Beach, MS	19-OP-45517	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC	Yes	12/11/2022 Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Paintsville, KY	19-OP-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Richie Pharmacal	Yes	In Process		
City of Paintsville	19-op-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Zydus	Yes	In Process		
City of Paintsville, KY	19-OP-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Alvogen	Yes	In Process		
City of Paintsville, KY	19-op-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes	Apotex	Yes	In Process		
		Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,			1			
Success County NI	10 on 45010	Olstein, Brody &	No	11/10/2022 Abbatt	Voc	In Drasses		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2022
Sussex County, NJ	19-op-45616	Agnello, P.C. Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,	No	11/18/2022 Abbott	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
		Olstein, Brody &						
Sussex County, NJ	19-OP-45616	Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022 Costco	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
Williamson County, IL	19-op-45657	Prince Law Firm	No	N/a Abbott	No	1111100033		Plaintiff's Fact Sheet is being completed.
City of Claremont, NH	19-op-45690	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023 Eric Knight MD	Yes	No		response to be provided
Sullivan County, NH	19-op-45704	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/1/2023 Eric Knight MD	Yes	No		getting dismissed
,.		Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,			1			
		Olstein, Brody &			1			
Passaic County, NJ	19-op-45741	Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022 Abbott	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
		Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,						
		Olstein, Brody &						
Passaic County, NJ	19-OP-45741	Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022 Costco	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
					1			Waiver of Service sent on November 26, 2019 when filing its short-form amended complaint by
City of Hoover, AL	19-op-45746	Wallace Jordan	No	10/28/2022 Target Corporation	Yes	In Process		regular mail to counsel of record.

	1		1		I	T			
Mandeville City, LA	19-op-45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Pearl River, La	19-op-45754	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Bingham County Idaho	19-op-45758	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pfizer	Yes			SHC not pursuing
Bingham County, Idaho	19-0p-45758	Simmons Hanly Conroy,	INO	11/10/2022	Auburn	res			SHC not pursuing
Bingham County, ID	19-op-45758	LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	11/7/2019	
City of Slidell, LA	19-op-45769	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Western Berth									
Washington Parish Government, LA	19-OP-45773	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Board of Commissioners of	15-01-45775	Legel & Shaw	163		Suit Filatifiaceuticais	163	163	3/14/2023	Waiver of service was originally sent to Alvogen. Alvogen signed and returned the waiver of
	19-OP-45785	Hutton & Hutton	Yes	N/A	Alvogen	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	service. The executed waiver of service was filed on the docket on 2/15/23.
City of Jackson, MS	19-OP-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Morris & Dickson	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Jackson, MS	19-op-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	3 Pfizer	Yes	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe	19-op-45841				Sun Pharmaceutical	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
	19-op-45841	Robins Kaplan LLP	No	Tribes not required to file PFS.	Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		The Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan is an Indian Tribe. Guidance from the MDL Tribal Leadership Committee is that Tribes are not subject to the current Order on PFS/Service issues. In any event, attempts to secure a Waiver of Service on Auburn in compliance with CMO were undertaken when Complaint was filed and continue today. Auburn has been uncooperative.
City of Auburn	19-OP-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	2 Morris & Dickson	No			
St. Francois County, MO	19-op-45847	Stranch, Jennings & Garvey PLLC	No	2/21/2023	R Assertio	Yes	No		This Defendant has been dismissed.
	19-OP-45852	Napoli Shkolnik	No		2 Morris & Dickson	No	NO		This Defendant has been dishlissed.
, ,	19-OP-45853	Napoli Shkolnik	No		Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Saratoga Springs,		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-	, , ,					
NY	19-OP-45857	Napoli Shkolnik	No		Morris & Dickson	No			
County of Kauai, HI	19-OP-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
Mayflower Municipal Health Group	19-op-45897	Napoli Shkolnik	No	NA	Apotex	Yes	Yes	11/25/2019	PFS is not applicable, as per Judge Polster Order (docket #368) dated 6/19/18 Plaintiff Fact Sheet is not required for this Plaintiff
		Pogust Millrood, Stampone O'Brien							
Burlington County, NJ	19-op-45928	Dilsheimer, Smithbridge	No	Pending	Abbott	No			
City of Pascagoula, MS	19-OP-45934	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC	Yes	1/17/2020 & 12/11/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
Lincoln County, WA	19-OP-45962	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	2/21/2023	Waiver filed 2/21/23. Only plaintiff client of KR to sue Sun Pharmaceuticals. Service oversight. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. Waiver returned 2/21/23.
Westmoreland Co., VA	19-OP-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	No			
Westmoreland County, VA	19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	4/12/2021	
Westmoreland County, VA	19-OP-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	4/6/2021	
	19-op-46011				GCP Pharma	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).

	1							
Cumberland County, NJ	19-op-46016	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023 Abbott	No			
		Weisbrod Matteis &						
		Copley PLLC, Cooper						
Atlantic County, NJ	19-OP-46071	Levenson	Yes	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	6/16/2021	Defendant Waiver of Service, Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
Chart Matal Warkers Lead 20								DEC is not applicable, as now ludge Deleter Order (deelet #300) detect (/40/40 Deletiff Foot Cheet is
Sheet Metal Workers Local 38 Insurance and Welfare Fund	19-op-46094	Napoli Shkolnik	No	NA Apotex	Yes	Yes	12/6/2019	PFS is not applicable, as per Judge Polster Order (docket #368) dated 6/19/18 Plaintiff Fact Sheet is not required for this Plaintiff; defendant counsel submitted waiver via email 12/6/19
insurance and wenare rund	19-0p-40094	тароп эпконик	INO	INA Apotex	163	res	12/0/2019	not required for this riamtin, defendant courses submitted waiver via email 12/0/15
Pipefitters Local 636								PFS is not applicable, as per Judge Polster Order (docket #368) dated 6/19/18 Plaintiff Fact Sheet is
Insurance Fund	19-op-46095	Napoli Shkolnik	No	NA Apotex	Yes	Yes	12/6/2019	not required for this Plaintiff; defendant counsel submitted waiver via email 12/6/19
City of Buffalo, NY	19-OP-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022 Morris & Dickson	No			
County of Allegheny,								
NY	19-OP-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
		Sanders Phillips						
		Grossman, LLC AKA						
Occan County NI	10 an 46157	Milberg Coleman Bryson		Abbett	No	In Process		
Ocean County, NJ City of Amsterdam, NY	19-op-46157 19-OP-46162	Phillips Grossman, LLC Napoli Shkolnik	Yes No	Abbott 12/22/2022 Morris & Dickson	No No	In Process		
City of Poughkeepsie, NY	19-OP-46162 19-OP-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022 Morris & Dickson	No			
E. Baton Rouge Parish	15 01 40103	reapon shrolling	140	12/22/2022 WOTTS & DICKSOTT	140			
Clerk of Court, LA	19-OP-46164	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
,		,,						
East Baton Rouge Parish, LA	19-op-46164	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023 Abbott	No			
Town of Gramercy, LA	20-OP-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
		Bahe Cook Cantley &						
_		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn						
City of Henderson, KY	20-op-45062	Law	No	1/10/2023 Assertio	No			
Handin Causty Fiscal Caust 100								
Hardin County Fiscal Court, KY;								
Breckenridge County Fiscal Court, KY; Green County Fiscal								
Court, KY; Meade County Fiscal		Bahe Cook Cantley &						
Court, KY; Ohio County Fiscal		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn		1/10/23, 1/10/23,				
Court, KY	20-op-45063	Law	Yes	1/10/23, 1/31/23 Assertio	No			
		Bahe Cook Cantley &	1	7, -0, -0, -1, -0, -0, -0, -0, -0, -0, -0, -0, -0, -0				
		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn						
Hardin County, KY, et al.	20-op-45063	Law	Yes	Abbott	No			
		Stranch, Jennings &						
Camden County, MO	20-op-45068	Garvey PLLC	No	2/21/2023 Assertio	Yes	No		This Defendant has been dismissed.
		Stranch, Jennings &						
Lincoln County, MO	20-op-45069	Garvey PLLC	No	2/21/2023 Assertio	Yes	No		This Defendant has been dismissed.
								TI MDI C. 11 1 40 2000 F. 151 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Bunkin Consul Hamital		Nablatt Basel 0						The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states
Bunkie General Hospital (Avoyelles Parish), LA	20-OP-45098	Neblett, Beard &	No	Morris & Dickson	No			that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a PFS. "
BOCC of Lincoln County, OK	20-0P-45098 20-op-45128	Arsenault Napoli Shkolnik	No Yes	GCP Pharma	No Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Prs. Other entities (e.g., Hospitals, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a Prs.
Vernon County, MO	20-0p-45128 20-0P-45133	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Morris & Dickson	No	res	3/10/2023	
vernon county, wo	20-01-43133	Theodora Oringher FC	163	WOTTS & DICKSOTT	INO			
								This client is not a political subdivision and therefore not subject to submission of a PFS. Counsel
								for Plaintiff reached out to counsel representing Morris and Dickson and shared that
								correspondence with Liaison Counsel once learning that Morris and Dickson erroneously listed this
LSU Board of								plaintiff on their Exh. A, which responded to Order at Dkt. 4801. This plaintiff should not be
Supervisors, LA	20-OP-45157	Irpino Avin Hawkins	No	Morris & Dickson	No			included on Exh. A and is not subject to compliance/issues raised in the Order at Dkt. 4801.
City of Morganfield, KY	20-op-45167	Frazer PLC	No	2/6/2023 Assertio	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service Requested; no response.
Stone County, MS	20-op-45168	Frazer PLC		Assertio	Yes			Voluntarily Dismissed as Duplicative Action
Barton County, MO	20-OP-45171	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes	Morris & Dickson	No			
Assumption Davish								Descend Consider of short form amonded complaint with state and a state of the stat
Assumption Parish	20-OP-45205	Logor & Shaw	No	2/23/2023 Sun Pharmaceuticals	Vos	Vec	2/15/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Policy Jury Assumption Parish	ZU-UF-43ZU3	Leger & Shaw	No	2/25/2025 Suri Fridiffide Ceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	per vice of process fraue 3/14/2023. Executed Return of service filed 5/15/2025.
Police Jury, LA	20-OP-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023 Morris & Dickson	No			
i once july, LA	20 01 73203	Legel & Jilaw	1,40	2/23/2023 MOTHS & DICKSOIT	1110	I		

	1		1	T					
Leland Falcon, Sheriff of									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Assumption Parish	20-OP-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/202	3 Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Assumption Parish	20 01 43200	Leger & Shaw	110	2,23,202	Jan i namaccaticais	103	163	3/13/2023	Service of process made 3/11/2023. Exceded Netarifor Service filed 3/13/2023.
Sheriff, LA	20-OP-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/202	3 Morris & Dickson	No			
West Ascension Parish	20 01 15200	2080. 0.0.0.0	1.10	=, =0, =0=	Jimeriis & Bienseii	1			
Hospital Service District, LA	20-OP-45207	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/202	3 Morris & Dickson	No			
	20 01 15207			=, ==, ===		+			
Lafourche Parish									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Government	20-OP-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/202	3 Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish		Ŭ				1			
Government, LA	20-OP-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/202	3 Morris & Dickson	No			
McDonald County, Missouri	20-op-45225	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		UCB	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Daphne, AL	20-OP-45227	Mantiply & Assoc.	No	10/28/202	2 Morris & Dickson	No		, ,	
, , , ,						1			
Catawba Nation, SC	20-op-45234				GCP Pharma	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
White Mountain Apache									The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
Nation, AZ	20-op-45243				GCP Pharma	Yes			Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Hughes County Board of									
Commissioners, OK	20-OP-45258	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Fultondale, et al.,									
AL	20-OP-45265	Mantiply & Assoc.	No	10/28/202	2 Morris & Dickson	No			
New Madrid County, MO	20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Apotex	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Andrew County, MO	20-OP-45298	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Morris & Dickson	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Grundy County, MO*	20-OP-45300	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Morris & Dickson	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
			L.		000 01			2/45/2022	
BOCC of Hughes County, OK	20-op-46258	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Ascension Parish School				24.422					
Board, LA	21-OP-45006	Leger & Shaw	No	3/1/202	3 Morris & Dickson	No			
				- ((. / /	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
St. Bernard Parish School Board	21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/202	3 TopRx	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
St. Bernard Parish				- / /				- / /	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
School Board	21-OP-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/202	3 Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. Bernard Parish									
School Board, LA	21-OP-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/202	3 Morris & Dickson	No		42.42.22	
Barry County, MO	21-OP-45016	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Morris & Dickson	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Town of Gramercy, LA	21-OP-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/202	3 Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Parish									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
School Board	21-OP-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/202	3 Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Parish School									
Board, LA	21-OP-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/202	3 Morris & Dickson	No			
	1								
			1						Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
Town of Lutcher, LA	21-OP-45035	Leger & Shaw	No		3 Sun Pharmaceuticals	_	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Lutcher, LA	21-OP-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/202	3 Morris & Dickson	No			
Lafourche Parish									Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for
School Board	21-OP-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/202	3 Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish School									
Board, LA	21-OP-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/202	3 Morris & Dickson	No			
		Wick Phillips Gould &							We were waiting for the moratorium to be lifted, and are actively considering any settlements that
		1 .	1	I	•	1	1	D 2/20/2022	and the state of t
Tarrant County Hospital District	t 21-op-45077	Martin	No	By 3/29/2023	Target Corporation	Yes	No	By 3/29/2023	are presented, but, if necessary, will immediately begin service
Tarrant County Hospital District	t 21-op-45077 21-OP-45077	Martin Wick Phillips Gould &	No	By 3/29/2023 By 3/29/2023	Target Corporation	Yes	No	By 3/29/2023 By 3/29/2023	We were waiting for the moratorium to be lifted, and are actively considering any settlements that are presented, but, if necessary, will immediately begin service

Case: 1:17-md-02804-DAP Doc #: 4977-1 Filed: 03/29/23 225 of 225. PageID #: 611616

	ı	T		T	1		T	1	
City of Burnell 104: City of									
City of Russell, KY; City of Jenkins, KY; City of Pineville,									
· · · · · ·				2/1/22 1/21/22					
KY; City of Worthington, KY;		Bahe Cook Cantley &		2/1/23, 1/31/23,					
City of Vanceburg, KY; City of		,		1/31/23, 1/25/23,					
Greenup, KY; City of South	24 45004	Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn	N -	1/25/23, 1/31/23,	A	N-			
Shore, KY; City of Bellefonte, KY	21-op-45094	Law Bahe Cook Cantley &	No	1/31/23, 1/26/23	Assertio	No			
		Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn							
Bussell City, KV, et al.	21 on 45004		No	2/1/2023	Abbett	No			
Russell City, KY, et al.	21-op-45094	Law	No	2/1/2023	ADDOLL	No			
Marion County Board of									
Education, WV; Wyoming									
County Board of Education,									
WV; Kanawha County Board of									Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the
Education, WV; McDowell									fact sheet, and the Court's stay on ligitation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were
County Board of Education, WV	22-on-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Assertio	Yes	In Process		served on Feb. 23, 2023.
City of	22 OF 13020	Scott+Scott Attorneys at			7.050.00	1.00			A copy of PFS, which was submitted to resubmitted portal on 10/7/22, was sent and received by
Jacksonville, FL	3:18-cv-00751-TJC-PDE		Yes		Michael Babich	No			Babich's counsel on 2/22/23
,		Sonosky, Chambers,							
		Sachse, Miller &							
		Monkman, LLP;							
		Gilbert LLP;							
		Fields, Han & Cunniff							
		LLC;		N/A: Pursuant to ECF					
		Boies Schiller Flexner		No. 642, Tribes were					
Muscogee (Creek) Nation,		LLP;		not required to					
OK v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et	N.D. Ohio, 1:18-op-	Keating Muething &		submit Plaintiff Fact	Pharmacy Buying				
al.	45459-DAP	Klekamp PLL		Sheets	Association	No		2020	ECF No. 4878 acknowledges service as of 2020
									The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and
Iowa Tribe of Kansas and									fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In
	N.D. Ohio, 1:20-op-				Pharmacy Buying				addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
Cephalon, Inc. et al.	45099-DAP				Association	No			Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Sac and Fox Nation of									The DEC nates the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendent as its anniance.
Missouri in Kansas and									The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and
	N.D. Ohio, 1:20-op-				Dharman Dunin -				fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In
· · · ·					Pharmacy Buying	V			addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government
et al	45161-DAP	I	1	1	Association	Yes	I	1	Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).